DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 888 HE 004 362

AUTHOR	Gelber, Seymour
TITLE	The Role of Campus Security in the College Setting.
INSTITUTION	National Inst. of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	219p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 2700-00172, $2.60)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Environment; *Higher Education; Legal Problems; Organization; *Police; *Police School Relationship; *Security

ABSTRACT

This study identifies and describes legal and operational structures of campus security offices, obtains an appraisal of campus security offices by students, faculty, and administrators and develops a proposed model for the effective use of campus security officers within a college setting. Following an overview of the study, Chapter II traces the history of the early beginnings when the tasks of the security officer were the responsibility of many individuals of both high and low order. The chapter describes the events to date which brought about the formalizing of the campus security directors. Chapter III emphasizes in tabular form the state statutes from which the campus security officer derives his authority as well as the court cases and attorney general opinions interpreting these statutes. Chapter IV, by use of a questionnaire to the campus security directors, examines personnel characteristics, the availability and use of specialized training and equipment, the relationships with other components on campus and the security force liaison with off-campus police. Chapter V, by utilizing an appraisal and role perception instrument, enables the campus security director, the faculty, the students and the administrators to appraise the conduct and to estimate the needs of the security force. Chapter VI summarizes the available data and offers a model security force suited for the performance of major control functions not inconsistent with a supportive, integrated relationship with students. (Author/MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 087888

THE ROLE OF CAMPUS SECURITY IN THE COLLEGE SETTING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 362

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice

ED 083888

THE ROLE OF CAMPUS SECURITY IN THE COLLEGE SETTING

By

SEYMOUR GELBER

Administrative Assistant State Attorney

Dade County, Florida

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

The Institute reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate or otherwise use, and to authorize others to publish and use all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

Copyright 1972 by
Seymour Gelber

DECEMBER 1972

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402
Price $2.60 Domestic postpaid or $2.25 GPO Bookstore
Stock Number 2700-00172

FOREWORD

A sometimes forgotten figure in the turmoil which has surrounded campus disorders in the recent past has been the campus security officer. Conceptions of his role range from that of a watchman or contracted guard to that of a professional law enforcement official with full peace officer powers. Further study of his role on the campus is necessitated not only by the rise in student demonstrations but also by the increase in student enrollments, the consequent greater number of cars, the expansion of the physical plant itself and the rise in the individual crime rate.

This study describes the role of the campus security officer in terms of historical origins, legal structures and operational functions. It provides an appraisal of the campus security officer by four components of the educational institution. Recommendations include a model which has three primary elements - patrol, investigation and student services.

"The Role of Campus Security in the College Setting" was prepared by Seymour Gelber as his doctoral dissertation.

Dr. Gelber has obtained both a Doctor of Philosophy degree and a Masters degree in Criminology from Florida State University. He also holds a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Miami Law School. He is currently serving as the Administrative Assistant State Attorney in the prosecutor's office in Dade County, Florida in addition to lecturing at the University of Miami Law School.

Martin B. Danziger
Assistant Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Significance of the Problem	1
Review of Related Literature	3
Conceptual Framework	9
Procedures	12
Chapter Summary and Review	13
II. A HISTORY OF CAMPUS SECURITY	16
Early Origins	16
Campus Security Responses as to Historical Origins of Their Institutions	28
The Organizing of Associations of College and University Security Directors	31
Chapter Summary and Conclusions	32
III. LEGAL OVERVIEW	
Authority of the Campus Security Officer	34
State Statutory Requirements of Minimum Basic Training of Campus Security Officers in Campus Disorder Situations	42
Administrative Rules and Policies Concerning the Role of the Campus Security Office in Campus Disorder Situations	44
Chapter Summary and Conclusions	52
IV. OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS	53
Personnel Characteristics	55
The Availability and Use of Specialized Training and Equipment	69
Relationships with Other Components on Campus	80
Off-Campus Police Liaison	89

Chapter

	Page
The Security Officer's Function in Campus Disorder Situations	94
Chapter Summary and Conclusion	99
V. APPRAISAL OF CAMPUS SECURITY FUNCTIONS	104
Personnel and Administration	106
Campus Security Relationships with Students	116
Campus Disorder Situations	124
Chapter Summary and Conclusions	133
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	139
Summary of Findings	139
Conclusions	150
Recommendations: A Proposed Model	156
Appendixes	
A. STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE AND APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT	163
B. SOURCE OF CAMPUS AUTHORITY: BY STATE	171
C. STATE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR MINIMUM BASIC TRAINING OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS	191
D. ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING THE CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICER ACCORDING TO THE MASTER PLANS FOR CAMPUS DISORDER SITUATIONS AT TWENTY-FIVE SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES	196
Bibliography	205

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Classifications of 210 Responding Colleges According to Type of Institutional Control, Academic Level, and Enrollment	54
2.	Percentage of Campus Security Officers Employed Full-time by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	56
3.	Percentage of Part-time Security Officers, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	58
4.	Percentage of Students Employed as Campus Security Officers, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	59
5.	Percentage of Women Employed as Campus Security Officers, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	60
6.	Average School Years Completed by Campus Security Officers, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	61
7.	Average Age of Campus Security Officers, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	63
8.	Employment Benefits of Campus Security Officers, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	65
9.	Perceptions by Campus Security Officers of Their Advantages Over the Local Police, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	66

Table		Page
10.	Reasons Given by Campus Security Officers for Needing to Increase the Security Staff, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	68
11.	Required Training for Campus Security Officers, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	70
12.	Non-policing Duties of Campus Security Officers, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	72
13.	Department Specialists Employed in Campus Security Offices, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	74
14.	Source of Undercover Agents for Campus Security Officers, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment.	75
15.	Source of Intelligence for Campus Security Office, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	77
16.	Security Equipment Used in Campus Security Office, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment	79
17.	Crowd Control Equipment Available to Campus Security Office, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment.	81
18.	Campus Security Office Participation in Policy-making Areas, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment.	83

Table Page

19. Regularly Held Meetings Between Campus Security Office and School Committees, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 84

20. Regular Exchange of Information Between Campus Security and Office of Student Affairs, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 86

21. Campus Security Office Participation in Student Programs, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 88

22. Security Office Assistance to Students in Off-campus Arrests, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 90

23. Local Police Availability to Campus Security Office, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 91

24. Violations of State Law Which Local Police Permit Campus Security to Handle Within the College's Discipline Structure, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment . 93

25. Source of Initial Policy-making Authority in Campus Disorder Situations, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 95

26. Source of Tactical Decision-making Authority When Outside Police are Present by Total Percentage and According to Classifications by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 96

27. Actions Taken Against Students in Campus Disorder Situations, by Total Percentage, by Type of Institutional Control, by Academic Level, and by Enrollment 98

Table

Page

28. Goals Deemed Appropriate for the Campus Security Office According to the Four Campus Groups by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of Those Colleges With all Four Groups Responding . . . 107

29. Internal Consistency of Sixteen Selected Items Showing the Number of Affirmative Responses to Each Item Within Each School of Eighty-nine Schools With all Groups Responding 108

30. Administrative Procedures to Improve Operation of Campus Security Office According to the Four Groups, by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of Those Colleges With all Four Groups Responding. . 111

31. Duties of the Campus Security Office Performed Most Effectively by Rank Order Selection Among Four Campus Groups 114

32. Personnel Changes Which Would Most Improve the Performance of the Campus Security Office by Rank Order Selection Among Four Campus Groups 115

33. Causes Accounting for Student Misunderstanding of the Campus Security Role According to the Four Groups, by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of Those Colleges With all Four Groups Responding 118

34. Enforcement Actions Creating Stress Situations Between Students and Security Officers According to the Four Groups, by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of Those Colleges With all Four Groups Responding 120

35. Changes in Use of Authority Which Will Improve Campus Security Relationships According to the Four Groups, by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of Those Colleges With all Four Groups Responding 122

Table Page

36. Purposes Served by Having Formal Institutional Policy Regarding Student Demonstrations According to the Four Groups, by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of Those Colleges With all Four Groups Responding 125

37. Occurrences That May Change an Orderly Student Demonstration Into a Campus Disorder, According to the Four Groups, by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of the Colleges With All Four Groups Responding. 127

38. Attitude That Will Prevail in the Event Campus Security Uses Necessary Force to Respond to Campus Disorder According to the Four Groups, by Percentage of the Total Population and by Percentage of the Colleges With all Four Groups Responding . . . 129

39. Enforcement Agencies Most Qualified to Respond to Campus Disorders by Rank Order Selection Among Four Campus Groups 132

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe legal and operational structures of campus security offices, to obtain an appraisal of campus security offices by students, faculty, and administrators and to develop a proposed model for the effective use of campus security officers within a college setting.

Significance of the Problem

The high incidence of organized campus dissent in the last several years has focused attention on measures to maintain the protection and security of campus property and personnel. The ability of internal security forces on campus to respond to disorder and the manner in which they would join in this effort with other external law enforcement groups are points of concern among many institutions.

The evolution from the old, gentle watchman with a flashlight to the use of modern, sophisticated electronic devices has taken place with little regard for events which have transformed the character of the college to a more student-centered institution. The increased quantity and

quality of student personnel services and the trend toward integrating non-teaching functions into the student's learning experience appear to be occurring with minimal involvement of the campus security officer.

The importance of responding to campus demonstrations has not lessened the significance of the duties involving parking and traffic control, grounds and building patrol, criminal investigation, and the numerous other assignments of the campus security office. These services must also be re-evaluated in terms of the everchanging scene in higher education.

The variety of the kinds of services demanded, the many publics that need be satisfied, the several levels of enforcement authority, and the differing approaches used, all suggest some uncertainty as to both the most effective techniques and the most appropriate role for the campus security office.

A new look is being taken by legislatures, administrators, faculties and students at this previously 'invisible' man on campus. Decisions will have to be made as to his function, the kind of person he must be, the precise goals the institution sets for his services, his status in the administrative hierarchy as well as his relationship to the other components of the educational system.

Review of Related Literature

The campus security office has been a source of limited scholarly investigation. The surge of campus disorder in recent years has resulted in extensive articles and books describing demonstration and their causes, but the role of the campus security officer is referred to only in incidental manner.

Robert Etheridge's 1958 work is the sole dissertation in the field.[1] He studied nine major mid-western universities similar in size, educational objectives, student bodies and administrative organization. His purpose was to analyze the organization, the administration and the objectives of campus protective and enforcement programs and to compare them to the regulatory functions of the student personnel programs. Etheridge's methodology included structured interviews with the Chief Campus Security Officer and the Dean of Student Personnel Affairs at each of the nine institutions, personal observations based on campus visits and an examination of published materials such as student codes and traffic regulations. From an historical point of view Etheridge found that

---

[1]Robert F. Etheridge, "A Study of Campus Protective and Enforcement Agencies at Selected Universities" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1958).

> The most significant changes which have taken place in most of the campus protective and enforcement agencies have occurred since the termination of World War II. The police agencies have increased in size and the scope of activities have changed from a primary emphasis for providing watch services to providing a wide range of services in traffic regulation, investigation and other areas of normal police service. There were no administrative relationships between university police and those areas of the university responsible for academic affairs or public service.[1]

The Etheridge study established the following as significant concerns of that era:

> The universal problems of the campus protective and enforcement agencies were the situations created by motor vehicles.[2]

> Few activities have had such profound implications upon student life and manners as have this type of 'spring outburst' (panty raids).[3]

> There was no uniform method employed to control student groups except that an attempt was made to contain the students and keep them moving in an orderly fashion, if possible.[4] Suppressive tactics generally were not employed.

Etheridge recommended a closer working relationship between student personnel officers and campus security to effect a more integrated effort in behalf of the student. He urged improved hiring and training standards and a re-examination of emergency procedures and their coordination with the community.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 87.

[2] Ibid., p. 205.

[3] Ibid., p. 175.

[4] Ibid., p. 197.

In 1970, Swen C. Nielsen, Chief Security Officer at Brigham Young University, completed a Master's Degree thesis[1] based on his own experience and on data gathered in 1968 and in 1969 from members of the National Association of College and University Traffic and Security Directors (now the International Association of College and University Security Directors). The 1968 questionnaire data examined the internal machinery of the campus security office and Nielsen concluded that the office should be directly under the aegis of the president or executive vice-president. The 1969 data related to the number of false arrest suits arising from campus security activity and Nielsen's findings showed only six such actions out of almost 5,000 arrests. Nielsen was of the opinion that the university police should be given broad authority in enforcing the law.

In the period between Etheridge and Nielsen no definitive study was attempted. Alfred Iannarelli's 1968 book on campus security is primarily an operational manual.[2] Iannarelli, Security Chief at California State College, Hayward, describes the table of organization of a typical department and the specific job functions of the personnel.

---

[1]Swen C. Nielsen, "General Observations of Organizational and Administrative Concepts for University Police" (unpublished Master's Degree thesis, Brigham Young University, May, 1970).

[2]Alfred V. Iannarelli, The Campus Police (Hayward, California: Precision Photo-Form Company, 1968).

Commentaries on the professional aspects of campus security such as the purchasing of equipment, communication techniques and the use of personnel have appeared with some regularity in the magazines, American School and University and The Security World.

The International Association of College and University Security Directors (IACUSD) recently completed a twenty-question, data-gathering study of each of its member organizations.[1] The information describes each institution and ascertains the existence of certain duties, responsibilities and policies. No treatment is afforded any of the data.

The issue of campus disorder has brought forth a multitude of reports and studies. The more prominent reports include "The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence," "The American Bar Association Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent," and "Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations" (Linowitz Committee). Many state legislatures and institutions of higher education have also examined the problem in its local application. The substance of these findings generally goes to the causes of the disorder and to an examination of charges pertaining to the use of repressive tactics by off-campus police.

---

[1]International Association of College and University Security Directors, Security Service Analysis (Macomb, Illinois: Western Illinois University, 1970).

The most current review has been made by the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Issued in September, 1970, their report is highly critical of the excessive force used by National Guard and other troops in responding to campus disorders.

A study in 1970 by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges looked at the plans to deal with dissent and the steps taken to eliminate the causes of student discontent.[1] From information gathered from university policy statements, news releases, public addresses, committee reports and press reports, examples were developed to show the positive steps taken to produce constructive student involvement and campus reform. The document included a section on "Policies on Obstruction and Disruption" which provides examples of specific policy and warning statements that have recently been adopted at colleges and universities. The section on "University Preparedness for Disruption" gives examples of some school plans for handling disturbances on campus. The section on "Policies and Practices Regarding Police" cites examples of coordination among the institution, campus police and off-campus police.

The legal structure and function of the campus security office have not been directly reported in the research

---

[1]National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Constructive Changes to Ease Campus Tensions (Washington, D.C., 1970).

literature. The main sources for current reviews of legal actions involving higher education are Thomas E. Blackwell's law manual[1] and the case reports circulated by two organizations concerned with the legal affairs of education, the National Association of College and University Attorneys,[2] and the National Organization on Legal Problems of Education.[3] Their case reports provide the most recent citations on action in the area of student discipline and disorder without particular reference to the legal implications of the campus security officer role.

In summarizing the research effort it would appear that the decade between 1958 and 1968 saw no visible interest in this area. The last two years, however, have brought about renewed concern. The campus disorders are probably responsible for the current emphasis; but notwithstanding the revival, campus security research appears only on the periphery of the main interest. The major determination as to how campus security is best related to the educational components of the university and the conditions under which it can survive as a regulatory agency in a college setting are yet unanswered.

---

[1]Thomas E. Blackwell, College Law Loose Leaf Manual (Santa Monica, California: Thomas E. Blackwell, 1969).

[2]National Association of College and University Attorneys, Evanston, Illinois.

[3]National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, Topeka, Kansas.

Conceptual Framework

There are three alternative roles that the security officer may assume in the performance of his duties. These differ somewhat from those of the municipal police officer, in that institutions of higher learning permit and encourage a more discretionary, nonpunitive approach to enforcement. The three roles are not mutually exclusive and the ascendancy of one over the other on a particular campus is dependent upon the character of the institution and the characteristics of the officers.

The campus security officer's performance continuum begins at one end with an individualized approach aimed primarily at guidance and treatment rather than authoritarian control. This involves an integrated, close working relationship with the office of student personnel affairs and other aspects of the educational program.

The second posture involves selective enforcement. This attitude recognizes the campus as "unique" in that dissent is tolerated and encouraged. Only in extreme situations is the total legal machinery invoked. The campus security office is viewed by other members of the campus community as a necessary adjunct of the institution but with repressive capabilities.

The final approach is one of equality before the law, wherein each student assumes full responsibility for

committing any unlawful act, as does every citizen, no matter the prevailing tradition or cause. Students are held accountable and recognize the campus security office as a full-bodied representative of law enforcement.

The extent to which the security officer assumes elements of one or more of these roles is dependent upon many things: the limit of his legal authority, the existing established relationships within the institution, and the interaction among the various parties that arises from events requiring the exercise of authority. These roles differ considerably among institutions.

The choice among the three alternative roles available to the campus security office may be examined in terms of the following research questions:

1. What are the different sources and kinds of legal authority under which campus security offices function?

2. What role is legally defined for campus security offices in major stress situations such as organized or spontaneous campus disorder?

3. Are the equipment, manpower and training provided campus security offices sufficient to respond to all normal and forseeable enforcement contingencies?

4. To what extent and at what levels do the campus security offices relate to and participate with other components of the institution in the decision making process?

5. To what extent do the other components of the institution consider the activity of campus security contributory to educational goals and traditions?

6. Can campus security perform all its enforcement duties consistent with maintaining a supportive relationship with students?

Material responsive to the above research questions was provided through inquiry in the following areas:

1. A legal overview of the campus security office described the statutes of each of the states, the court cases that interpret these statutes, the attorney general opinions, the regulations of state coordinating agencies, and the administrative rules of the various institutions.

2. An examination of the operational performance of the campus security office categorized the groups according to variables of size and type of institutions, method of enforcement, and other appropriate classifications. The relationship with other groups on campus and with external police agencies, and the duties assigned to campus security in disorder situations were also examined.

3. An appraisal and role perception of the campus security function was made by four segments of the campus population. Campus security officers, faculty members, students, and administrators assessed the relationship of campus security with other components of the institution and also

inspected the role or the campus security office in organized campus disorder situation.

Procedures

The appropriate state agencies and institutions were surveyed by letter, requesting information to provide a national overview of the legal controls governing the campus security office. These sources included the attorneys general, state legislative reference bureaus, state higher education coordinating bodies, state agencies for police minimum training standards, and presidents of institutions of higher education. Legal research methods were employed to organize the relationships among the statutes, case law, opinions, regulations and rules.

For purposes of ascertaining the operational functions of the campus security offices, a questionnaire was distributed to the campus security directors of the 245 member schools of the IACUSD. Responses to the questionnaire were analyzed according to several variables. These were the types of institutional control (private or public), the academic levels (junior colleges, four year colleges, graduate universities), and the classifications by enrollment (five population categories).

A role perception and appraisal instrument of the campus security office was also submitted to each of the

following on the campuses of the membership of the IACUSD: the campus security director, the department chairmen in both political science and sociology, the editor of the campus newspaper, the president of the student government, and the dean for student personnel affairs. As explained in a subsequent chapter, only one student response and only one faculty response from each of the schools were included in the study population. The questions in the appraisal instrument were analyzed by comparing the total responses among each of the four groups and also by a rank order evaluation. Sixteen of these items were selected for an internal consistency examination to determine the extent of agreement of the four groups within each school.

The questionnaire and the appraisal instrument are included in Appendix A. A model for a 'new' campus security officer was projected, based on conclusions arising from the study of the present legal status of the campus security officer, the examination of his operational functions, his relationships with other components of the institution, the appraisal of his performance, and the recommendations by the various groups comprising the study population.

Chapter Summary and Overview

The need to contain student excesses has caused a reexamination of existing institutional approaches to campus disorders. The involvement of the security office in a

variety of service and control tasks suggests the possibility of an expanded and more responsive role. Although the literature reflects a plethora of studies on campus disorder, little serious attention is directed toward the performance of the campus security office, the conditions under which it functions or the potential of the office as a constructive force for order.

The values that may be derived from the campus security office can best be determined by an awareness of its historical antecedents, a knowledge of the legal base upon which it exists, a recognition of its organizational structure and an understanding of the relationships maintained with other segments of the university. The ensuing chapters will construct the security officer as he is portrayed historically, legally and functionally.

Chapter II traces the history of the early beginnings when the tasks he now performs were the responsibility of many individuals of both high and low order. The chapter describes the events to date which brought about the formalizing of the campus security office and the organizing of associations of college and university security directors.

Chapter III emphasizes in tabular form the state statutes from which the campus security officer derives his authority as well as the court cases and attorney general opinions interpreting these statutes. The requirements, by state, for minimum training and the administrative rules

concerning the role of the campus security office in campus disorder situations are similarly presented.

Chapter IV, by use of a questionnaire to the campus security directors, examines personnel characteristics, the availability and use of specialized training and equipment, the relationships with other components on campus and the security force liaison with off-campus police. It also describes the decision-making process when outside police aid is present and the actions taken by the institution.

Chapter V, by utilizing an appraisal and role perception instrument, enables the campus security director, the faculty, the students and the administrators to appraise the conduct and to estimate the needs of the security force.

Chapter VI summarizes the available data and offers a model security force suited for the performance of major control functions not inconsistent with a supportive, integrated relationship with students.

CHAPTER II

A HISTORY OF CAMPUS SECURITY

Early Origins

The Yale University Police Department, established in 1894, was probably the beginning of organized and professional protective policing service at an institution of higher learning. The genesis of the modern campus security officer, however, derives from many other sources. In different eras and on different campuses, his forerunner was the janitor or the watchman or the faculty chairman of the grounds committee, or in some instances the lineage could well be traced directly to the president of the institution.

The physical needs of early American higher education focused major concern on the construction of buildings, the providing of heat, the disposal of waste, the avoidance of fires, and the protection of property from both straying animals and irate townsfolk. Amid these spartan surroundings, a religious fervor and a firm discipline were to share in the implementation.

Perhaps the earliest practitioners were the bedels of the 15th century Oxford University who were servants appointed to execute the orders of the chancellor and the

proctors. They served writs, exacted fines, and escorted evil doers to prison, when they consented to go. The bedels worked for the proctors who were charged with keeping order, making lists of offenders and seeing to the punishment and fines. The proctors received small payments from the fines to cover the costs of the night watch and for the hire and repair of armour.[1]

The authority of the faculty and the president were asserted in 1656 by an Act of the Massachusetts General Court empowering the president and the fellows to punish all misdemeanors of Harvard youth, either by fines or whippings in the hall.[2] Notwithstanding the delegation of authority, Harvard found it often necessary to request the governor to direct the sheriff of Middlesex to provide aid. An arrangement was also made with justices of the peace in Cambridge for a constable and six men to walk and watch about the entry at the college hall to prevent disorder.[3]

The faculty and the executive maintained virtually an exclusive control over student conduct as well as over routine service problems that others might have more

---

[1]Charles Edward Mallett, A History of the University of Oxford, Vol. 1: The Medieval University (New York: Longsmans, Green, 1924), pp. 175, 325.

[2]Samuel Eliot Morison, Harvard College in the 17th Century (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), p. 23.

[3]Isiah Quincy, History of Harvard University (Cambridge, Mass.: John Owen, 1840), p. 1727.

appropriately performed. A Dartmouth College history identifies its first code of criminal law as enacted in 1782 and being enforced by the president and the faculty:[1]

> President Eleazor Wheelock's muscular frame was well adapted to kicking in the doors of these locked dens of iniquity. In truth, our admiration goes out to those professors who were so successfully maintaining an extreme dignity of manner in face of the duty of acting as police officers and detectives to ferret out the crimes of nimble youth.

A description of the duties (1892) of John Franklin Crowell, President of Duke University, emphasizes the day-to-day drudgery that included numerous maintenance chores: locks that did not work, lights that burned out at the Inn, a mattress that was lost. Or there were disciplinary problems of too much swearing, drunkenness, noise, improper dress or card playing.[2]

The faculty view is graphically expressed in an 1854 letter to the Dartmouth College Board of Trustees from the faculty member designated as the Inspector of the Buildings.[3]

> Considering the fact that there is not one solitary fact connected with the office that is not annoying and disagreeable, that the Inspector's time is not daily interrupted during a considerable portion of all the terms, but some entire vacations are required for completing small repairs and abating nuisances, further considering that there is no pollution, moral or physical about the

---

[1]Leon Burr Richardson, History of Dartmouth College (Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Press, 1932), p. 267.

[2]Earl W. Porter, Trinity and Duke-1892-1924 (Durham, North Carolina: University Press, 1964), p. 46.

[3]Richardson, p. 414.

> buildings which is not brought to his notice, that there is no complete loss of keys, breaking windows, doors, defiling of seats or any other disagreeable phase of college life which he must respond to, the Inspector confidentially believes that there is not a public office in the United States whose emoluments are so unequal to these duties. The variety of petty cases which grow directly out of this insignificant office are sufficient to cause even a patient man to exclaim, 'I would not live always in a college.'

Of more recent vintage (1923) a letter to the University of Michigan President from the Committee of Discipline calls for the creation of a fact-gathering agency to replace the faculty efforts. The letter plaintively states:[1]

> I doubt if you or the Regents would approve, even if we were willing, for the members of the Committee to spend their time ambushing bootleggers and raiding student parties.

The failure or inability of the faculty and the administration to relinquish its prerogatives to specially trained personnel, except in cases of dire emergency, has perhaps delayed the growth of campus security forces, but many services had been provided at other than the faculty and executive levels.

The watchman performed significant tasks on campus. The threat of fires, night prowlers and Indians necessitated night watches, often jointly performed with the neighboring community. Preventing the incursions of wandering cattle, keeping the stoves going during the long winter nights, and serving as gate tender were other responsibilities of the

---

[1]Walter Donnelly, The University of Michigan, Vol. IV (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1958), p. 1830.

early watchmen.[1] These were students who received coffee and a kerosene lantern from the steward and after working from evening chapel until 5:00 A.M. were excused from classes all the next day. The installation of steam heat in 1896 put an end to wood-chopping and coal-carrying as well as limiting the need for night watches.[2] The gate served a useful as well as an ornamental purpose. It kept the cows out and tending it during the day, and closing it at night was a job that helped many boys through college.[3]

The development of the watchman in a policing capacity was rather sporadic. President John Bascom of the University of Wisconsin (1879) went no further than to employ a watchman to protect the grounds and buildings "only on pleasant summer afternoons."[4] In an unexplained situation at Tufts College, trustees had to take a hand in procedures in 1914 by employing a watchman "from noon to 10:00 P.M. on Sundays for the balance of the academic year to keep objectionable women off the college enclosure."[5]

---

[1]Morison, p. 23.

[2]Albert J. Freitag, College with a Cause (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), p. 96.

[3]Robert Taft, Across the Years on Mount Oread (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1941), p. 20.

[4]Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen, The University of Wisconsin (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949), p. 508.

[5]Russell E. Miller, History of Tufts College (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), p. 401.

A serious incident, which displayed the then contemporary standards, occurred on the night of October 31, 1893, at Ohio State University when a night watchman fired on a crowd of students, seriously wounding one of them. The trustees adopted the following resolution as a result of the incident:[1]

> That while we in no way approve of the students resisting an officer and believe that the watchman tried to do his duty, yet the occurrence of last night satisfied us that he lacks the coolness of judgment needed in such a position and we therefore recommend that he be discharged and the conduct of the student be referred to the faculty where it properly belongs.

The report was adopted and the watchman discharged. It also provided that a successor be employed at not more than $45.00 a month.

Many college histories report fires in which watchmen and other special school personnel played important roles. Pardee Hall of Lafayette College burned down in 1879 "while Mr. Fisler, Superintendent of Grounds, pleaded with the volunteer town companies to pour water down into the burning center rather than spraying the cornices." The fire companies were all bitterly jealous of one another and despite his directions, no concerted action resulted.[2]

---

[1]James E. Pollard, History of the Ohio State University 1873-1948 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1952), p. 62.

[2]David B. Skillman, The Biography of a College Life of Lafayette College (Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Press, 1932), p. 3.

The fire in a closet near a chimney in College Hall, University of Rhode Island (1895)[1] and the fire in Brick Dormitory, University of North Carolina (1904),[2] discovered by night watchmen, resulted in the destruction of the buildings but with no loss of life. Although the College Chapel burned down at Spring Hill College, Alabama, in 1909, the students unanimously acclaimed as the hero of the day, a Negro janitor known as Black Parson, "who though wounded and burnt and bleeding performed giant feats with his axe."[3]

Whereas the watchman is the direct lineal predecessor of the campus security officer, the janitor has also performed related functions. He was often the butt of campus humor and sometimes, as with Black Parson, emerged as an heroic figure. Early janitorial services were confined to freshmen but the new spirit that came in 1776 with the Revolution soon asserted itself among the undergraduates and they hired servants known as "scouts."[4] The janitor we may recognize today as being part of the "Building and Grounds Staff" is described by college historians as a colorful campus

---

[1]Herman F. Eschenbacker, The University of Rhode Island (New York: Meredith Publishing, 1967), p. 98.

[2]Elizabeth Ann Bowles, A Good Beginning (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1967), p. 316.

[3]Michael Kenny, Centenary Story of Spring Hill College (New York: The American Press, 1931), p. 316.

[4]Samuel Batchelder, Bits of Harvard University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1924), p. 281.

character long remembered by the students. The History of Trinity College (Connecticut), introduces "Professor Jim" in the year 1835 as the "Professor of Dust and Ashes" whose duties were merely to ring the morning bell. When it became his additional duty to sweep the rooms and make up sixty beds, "Professor Jim," the garrulous fellow he was, seldom got very far on his appointed rounds and the students themselves were obligated to sweep, carry water and empty slop jars.[1]

The History of Colby College (Maine) quotes this eulogy for their janitor in 1866.[2]

> Samuel Osborne was more than a janitor. He was campus policeman, unofficial guidance officer, advisor alike to students and faculty, and above all a man of touching kindness.

Catherine Drinker Bowen in her History of Lehigh University reports this description of the janitor in the 1867 "Rules for Students."[3]

> The janitor is an officer of the University, specially placed by the President in charge of the building and grounds. He is delegated to direct disorders to cease, and to report damages and breaches of order to the President.

---

[1]Glenn Weaver, The History of Trinity College (Hartford, Conn.: Trinity College Press, 1967), p. 40.

[2]Ernest Cummings Marriner, The History of Colby College (Waterville, Maine: Colby College Press, 1963), p. 235.

[3]Catherine Drinker Bowen, History of Lehigh University (Lehigh, Pa.: Lehigh Alumni Bulletin, 1924), p. 11.

Many institutions depended on protective services other than those provided by watchmen or janitors. Schools offering military training relied on the military system for maintaining order. The commandant was especially charged with the details of policing the campus with the help of various cadet officers who were expected to exact obedience from their subordinates and to report in writing the infraction of the rules.[1] In some situations private detectives were hired for special investigations involving major unsolved thefts or cases of serious student misconduct. For example, in 1880, the Wisconsin Board of Regents employed detectives to search out student ringleaders who were organizing opposition to military drill on campus.[2]

The use of private detectives on campus did not preclude the presence of local police officers from adjacent communities. Their enforcement forays into the university generally engendered ill feeling. Yale University's claim to the first campus security officer in 1894 came about as an effort to resolve this acute relationship. The University "borrowed" two New Haven Police Department officers who by patrolling within the campus grounds and working directly with the students might lessen tensions. The apparent success of

---

[1]James F. Hopkins, The University of Kentucky-Origin and Early Years (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1951), p. 168.

[2]Curti and Carstensen, op. cit.

the experiment prompted the officers to resign from the New Haven Police Department and receive commissions as constables in the employ of the University.[1]

Notwithstanding the experiment at Yale, student excesses continued to be treated with the aid of outside law enforcement as evidenced by the 1905 statute passed in neighboring Rhode Island:[2]

> The Sheriff of the County of Providence with as many of his deputies as he may deem necessary shall attend the celebration of the annual commencements of Brown University and Providence College and shall preserve peace and good order and decorum during same.

The advent of prohibition saw the situation aggravated by the frequent city and state police raids on fraternity drinking parties. Often the information upon which the raid was based came from the dean of students and the campus police.[3]

The development of the automobile marked the beginning of the 20th century campus security officer. The control of traffic and the problems incident to parking necessitated laws and individuals to enforce the laws. The Centennial History of the University of Nebraska described the

---

[1]William Wiser, Yale Memories (New Haven, Conn.: Morehouse and Taylor, 1914), p. 10.

[2]Rhode Island, General Laws, Title 42, Ch. 29, Sec. 21 (1905).

[3]Howard Peckham, The Making of the University of Michigan 1817-1967 (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1967), p. 183.

University's first parking crisis in 1890. The administration had published a notice that horses were not to be tied to trees for "such practice is harmful to the trees as it often breaks them down." The students countered with the demands that the University put up more hitching posts.[1] The History of the University of Maryland noted that student automobiles became a problem in 1927 when campus police issued their first parking ticket.[2] The student newspaper of the University of Illinois in an editorial on April 8, 1925, said:[3]

> We recognize the fact that the University administration looks with disfavor upon the student car. It has done all it can to discourage cars by abolishing parking on the campus during school hours and persuading the city commissioners to limit parking on Wright Street.

By 1928, Colgate University recognized that parking had become so much of a problem that the Trustees adopted a set of rules to deal with it.[4] At the University of Michigan cars were banned in 1927 and sixty-five students were

---

[1]Robert N. Manley, Centennial History of the University of Nebraska (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1969), p. 250.

[2]George H. Callcolt, History of the University of Maryland (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1966), p. 247.

[3]Roger Ebert, An Illini Century-One Hundred Years of Campus Life (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1967), p. 91.

[4]Howard Williams, A History of Colgate University 1819-1969 (New York: Van Nostrand, Reinhold Company, 1969), p. 304.

disciplined for failure to comply. Michigan President Little viewed the automobile as another disturbance in student life, affecting "scholarship, industry and morals."[1] The automobile problem was more than one of merely lack of parking space. It was a question of students, particularly women, behaving within proper moral constraints. By 1924, Trinity University (Texas), faculty members yielded to demands that senior women, with the approval of the Dean of Women, be allowed to ride in cars at stated hours in the afternoon and early evening.[2] The problem continued until after World War II, when the influx of mature veterans accelerated the issue. The History of Bowling Green State University reports the 1944 school catalog as forbidding students to use automobiles due to the lack of sufficient parking space on or near the campus. According to the author, the underlying reason was citizen complaints about couples parked in cars, both on city streets and country lanes. The cars also were used for joy riding and a number of serious accidents resulted.[3] The doctrine of "in loco parentis" required that the institution serve in the stead of the parents and the exercise of this policy

---

[1]Peckham, p. 167.

[2]Trinity University (San Antonio, Texas: Trinity University Press, 1967), p. 94.

[3]James Robert Overman, The History of Bowling Green University (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Press, 1967), p. 145.

required a force equipped to patrol the campus, its vehicles and environs.

Post World War II days saw a divestment of the watchman-janitor image and the formation of a formal organizational police structure. Some of the vestiges of the past remained and an uncertainty persisted as to their actual police authority, but the "campus cop" was a reality.

Campus Security Officer Responses as to Historical Origins of Their Institutions

In a random sampling of the 245 schools used in this study, an arbitrary one-third (1/3) of the campus security directors (82) were surveyed as to the origins of their office. Fifty-four (54) responded. Of these only 4 offices were formally organized prior to 1945 and 41 came into being in the last two decades.

Nineteen (19) responded that there was no particular campus incident or event that prompted the setting up of their security office. Eighteen (18) believed that growth in terms of enrollment, additional buildings, and traffic control required a more organized effort. Four (4) suggested that an increase in the incidence of serious crimes caused the change; 4 others blamed it on the inadequate services provided by private contract agencies; 5 attributed it to university re-organization; 1 security office was organized at the request of their liability insurance carrier. Only 1

of the total 54 was brought into being as a result of student disturbances.

A Louisiana State University comment adds an historical note.[1]

> During the middle thirties a number of southern colleges had a large influx of students from the East and a few from the midwest. Many of these students organized in gangs and pulled burglaries systematically. The University post office was a favorite target and in a period of six months at L.S.U., dozens of students were apprehended, criminally charged or dismissed from the University. Other southern schools were having the same problem at this time.

Thirty-three (33) of the 54 campus security directors responding stated that their early predecessors devoted major concern to "watching" for fires and 8 perceived the task as having been one of a night watch against prowlers and property protection. Three (3) saw it as a building custodial service and again only 1 considered student misbehavior as an important function of past campus security officers.

The impact of the automobile on many campuses is shown by the 29 directors who saw it as the basis for the change from watchman-guard function to traffic and crime control. Many schools found it necessary to set up new traffic control and parking units which eventually merged with the guard-watchman into one department. Sixteen (16) security chiefs observed that the advent of the automobile brought about no change. Several indicated that traffic, including

---

[1]Letter, C. R. Anderson, Chief, Campus Security, Louisiana State University, June 15, 1970.

the issuance of tickets, continued to be handled by watchmen and by janitors.

Thirty-six (36) chiefs stated that campus security personnel of the past were considered part of the school's disciplinary machinery in that they were obligated to report student misbehavior to the school authorities. Sixteen (16) answered in the negative. Most of the affirmative responses reported that their present role was unchanged but they indicated a differing emphasis in today's structure as reflected in this letter from the University of Arizona.[1]

> In the past they worked with the office of the Dean of Students but were not permitted to arrest or otherwise handle a problem as a police force. This has changed and matters are now handled through the Court.

Some of the smaller schools, however, noted little change.[2]

> The old style security officer was "leg man" for the Dean. We still are more or less "bogey men" who will report infractions to the Dean.

The responses by the directors suggest that the development of the campus security office has been determined by external physical factors rather than by some contribution for which the security office may have had special capabilities.

---

[1]Letter, D. C. Paxton, Security Supervisor, University of Arizona, June 9, 1970.

[2]Letter, Byrne A. P. Brien, Director of Security, Loras College, Iowa, June 13, 1970.

The watchman-guard employees were hardly disposed to become involved with the institution or the students as suggested by these two descriptions:

> These men were older, had been transferred from more physically demanding positions and more sort of "put out to pasture" prior to retirement.[1]

> The older retired Security Guard would seldom report student misbehavior, so long as the students wouldn't bother them personally.[2]

As events occurred, such as the appearance of the automobile, and the large increase in the number of campus buildings, the security office shifted, in slow gear, from a fire watcher to a protective and control function.

The Organizing of Associations of College and University Security Directors

In November 1958, eight campus security officers representing a national geographical cross-section met in Tempe, Arizona, to organize what would eventually be the International Association of College and University Security Directors. For three years they had been exchanging ideas and problems via correspondence and telephone. The first formal meeting of the new organization was held April 22, 1959, in Houston, Texas. Twenty-eight (28) schools were represented.

---

[1]Letter, Robert F. Ochs, Assistant to the President, Rutgers University, June 15, 1970.

[2]Letter, Chief Security Officer, Baylor University, June 12, 1970.

The Constitution adopted at the Houston meeting described the membership in Article III, Section IA, as follows:

> (a) Membership in the Association shall be open to the Administrator, Director of the Executive in direct and responsible charge of the operation, maintenance, planning and development of the security police or traffic department of educational institutions of higher learning which offer degrees requiring not less than two years of academic credit.

Prior to the creation of this organization, campus security personnel had been associated with several other national groups concerned with similar problems. These included the Association of Physical Plant Directors, the Higher Education Section of the Campus Safety Association, and the Association of College Business Officers. A regional security group was organized among Ivy League colleges in 1953 known as the Northeast College and University Security Association. It presently includes colleges and universities from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and the New England states.

In some states informal state-wide meetings among school security officers have taken place and several have organized formal groups such as the Louisiana College Security Officers, established in 1955.

Chapter Summary and Conclusions

The history of the campus security officer portrays a function that from earliest times included the protection of persons and property from the ravages of fire, marauding

Indians, thievery, and misuse of the automobile. It has involved a variety of services performed by numerous individuals classified under differing job descriptions. The watchman, the janitor, the guard, and various levels of faculty and administration, at different times and places, have each performed acts that are today considered within the responsibility of the campus security officer.

The haphazard growth that its history signifies forecasts an irregular pattern of authority for the security department of today. The past was one of always being subservient to the voices of the administrator, the faculty, and the off-campus police. To change this mold requires a sharp revision of the laws and policies governing the duties and conduct of the office.

CHAPTER III

LEGAL OVERVIEW

Authority of the Campus Security Officer

Until recent years the authority of campus security officers had been shrouded in uncertainty. There had been little legislation which specifically enumerated their duties and most functioned under derivative authority through deputization by the local sheriff or municipal police. Others traveled under statutes that appeared to provide color of legal authority but in fact had not been tested in court.

The recent attention devoted to campus security has resulted in the passage of a body of statutory law devoted specifically to campus security officers. These statutes authorize state institutions of higher learning to appoint campus security personnel who will have peace officer[1] authority. Among private colleges and universities only a few states provide for statutory appointment of campus security officers; instead these institutions must rely almost solely upon deputization by local police agencies.

---

[1] 5 American Jurisprudence 2d 714(1964) Peace Officer- At common law, peace officers are authorized to arrest felons without a warrant and as conservators of the peace they have authority to arrest for offenses less than felony committed in their presence.

The interpretation of the statutes has occurred primarily by attorney general opinion[1] with only a few court proceedings challenging the authority of the campus security officer. Inquiries to the 50 Attorneys General brought unofficial responses which also clarify the present position of the campus security officer. Appendix B is a compilation of the sources of campus authority and the legal interpretation thereof among the 50 states.

Twenty-seven (27) of the states permit the state governing body for higher education to appoint campus police officers with power to arrest. The remaining 23 states permit deputization of appointment through one of the following: the governor, the court, a law enforcement agency, or by a city government.

The private institutions have received little statutory consideration, with only 7 states providing direct authority. As a matter of course most private as well as public institutions obtain a deputy status with local law enforcement agencies in order to avoid litigation questioning their arrest authority.

---

[1] 7 Corpus Juris Secundum 1224(1964) Attorney General Opinion--The Attorney General is found, both at common law and under the statutes to render advice and opinion to questions of law arising with relation to matters affecting the executive department and the various state departments and legal officers. In some states an opinion has the validity of law until tested in a competent court.

The control of traffic and parking is based on the inherent authority of the board of regents or trustees to control the school property and on the statutes specifically authorizing institutional control. Legal arrangements have also been made with contiguous municipalities as to enforcement and judicial disposition.

The extent to which city and county police officers may exercise their authority on campus has not created serious controversy. Jurisdiction over violation of the criminal law has been generally held to be concurrent with that of campus police. In the California case of in re Bacon[1] growing out of the right of local police officers to enter campus grounds when uninvited by school officials, the court ruled:

> The fact that a school may employ its own police force does not give them exclusive jurisdiction over the school or in any way deprive the sheriff or the city police of their concurrent jurisdiction over the campus.

In a Colorado attorney general opinion[2] it was declared that town and municipal police officers have the duty to render assistance on state property when called upon by college officials. The Ohio case of McConnell vs. City of Columbus[3] held that a municipality must provide fire and police protection to a college within city limits. A Utah

---

[1] In re Bacon 240 Cal. Sup. 2d 34, 54 (1966).

[2] Attorney General Opinion 68-4241, August 16, 1968.

[3] McConnell vs. City of Columbus, 173 N.E.2 760, (1961).

attorney general opinion[1] enables the city police to exercise their arrest power if a nuisance or danger to the city is inherent in the action on state property.

An issue current on campus is the advisability of campus security officers displaying authority symbols such as uniforms, and using marked vehicles. In a number of states the absence of an authority symbol would make invalid any police action. The newly enacted Kansas statute (1970)[2] invests campus policemen with the authority of peace officers but adds the requirement that the badge of office must be worn and publicly displayed while on duty. A Georgia attorney general opinion[3] permits campus officers to patrol in unmarked vehicles but they may not use such cars to make arrests for traffic violations. New Mexico's statute[4] states that no arrest for violations relating to motor vehicles is valid unless the officer is both wearing a badge and is in police uniform.

Although considerable progress has been made in many states in regard to giving greater police authority to institutions of higher learning, limitations prevail in several

---

[1]Attorney General Opinion No. 69-010, February 3, 1969.

[2]Kan. Session Law Senate Bill No. 398 Sec. 16 (1970).

[3]Attorney General Opinion 67-327, September 13, 1967.

[4]New Mexico Statute-39-5-2 (1968).

jurisdictions. For example, in Minnesota[1] two investigators may be employed but arrest shall be exercised only in connection with investigations authorized by the regents. The West Virginia statute[2] specifically prohibits the appointment of a student as a security officer. Rhode Island has an 1896 statute which permits the town council to appoint a special constable who upon the "request of any citizen, and upon being tendered the sum of thirty cents for each hour service required, shall attend any school or meeting for the purpose of preventing any interruption or disturbance therein, with power of arrest." The State of Missouri statute[3] places a financial limitation on salary in that the University of Missouri may employ six watchmen who shall be paid not more than seventy-five dollars per month. Inasmuch as Missouri and Rhode Island also rely on deputization as a source of authority, the statutory limitation does not inhibit campus security operations. The curators of the University of Missouri may also grant arrest power to other employees and faculty members.

The source of campus security authority in the past has been mostly derivative. Since 1967, however, 23 states have passed statutes permitting a direct grant of authority from the board of regents, the president, or the governor.

---

[1] Minn. Laws Ch. 266, Sec. 137.12 (1969).

[2] W. Virginia, Code Ch. 18-2-24 (1967).

[3] R.S. Mo. Sec. 172. 350 (1959).

Despite the marked statutory increase, deputization is still generally practiced. There has been only a limited number of cases testing the campus security officer authority and it is anticipated that as courts more precisely define the role, the need for deputization will lessen.

The authority of a campus security officer to search a student dormitory for contraband, without benefit of a search warrant, has changed somewhat in recent years and perhaps greater change is in store. Amidst all the potential conflict areas that exist on a campus, this intrusion ranks high as a source of dissatisfaction.

The IV Amendment to the United States Constitution[1] clearly enunciates the citizen's protection against unreasonable search and seizure. In 1959, the case of Wolf vs. Colorado[2] made the IV Amendment applicable to the states through the due process clause of the XIV Amendment. The current posture of the general law as observed in Mapp vs. Ohio[3] (1963) sets many protective barriers around the citizen by insuring one's privacy against the arbitrary acts of

---

[1]U.S. Constitution, Amendment IV - The right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

[2]Wolf vs. Colorado, 338 U.S. 25 (1959).

[3]Mapp vs. Ohio, 367 Y.S. 643 (1963).

government agents. Search warrants must be precise in language, definite in description, and exact in concluding the existence of need.

The college as a "unique" institution and the "in loco parentis" relationship have buttressed the legal attitude in support of the proposition that the student's right to be secure against unreasonable search need not be inviolate. The law views the student as having waived certain rights and as having only temporary use of the dormitory premises. In People vs. Kelly[1] the court held that a school's right of entry is an implicit right reserved to the school to enable it properly to enforce discipline in the dormitories. In People vs. Overton[2] the police search of a locker was held constitutional notwithstanding an invalid search warrant. The Court ruled that the school had sufficient control over the room to justify any inspection. The case of People vs. Gallamon[3] supported the contention that a school administrator could delegate his authority to enter a dormitory to police officers. U.S. vs. Donato,[4] a 1967 case, upheld the earlier view that a search warrant is not necessary, theorizing that the school has not relinquished title to the

---

[1]People vs. Kelly. 16 Cal. Rptr. 177 (Ct. App. 1961).

[2]People vs. Overton. 229 N.E. 2d 596 (1967).

[3]People vs. Gallamon. 280. N.W. S. 2d 356 (1967).

[4]U.S. vs. Donato 269 I. Supp. 921. (1967).

property but is merely allowing the student temporary use of it.

Erosion of the absolute right of entry began with landmark (1961) Dixon case[1] which stated that the right to attend school may not be conditioned on a waiver of due process. Buttney vs. Smiley[2] viewed "in loco parentis" as no longer tenable and Moore vs. Troy State[3] established the legal position that a school no longer has unlimited right to enter without a warrant.

In Moore vs. Troy State the city police obtained permission from a dean for a marijuana search of a dormitory. The school handbook recited the authority of the school to enter and search and the occupant's duty to open personal baggage and any other sealed personal material for inspection. The court found that school regulations permitting entry were necessary to maintain order on campus and that the student's constitutional rights can be limited in favor of the greater public interest. A 1969 case, United States vs. Coles, approved a similar search conducted without benefit of a search warrant. In this case an administrator of a federal job corps center searched the suitcase of a corpsman for

---

[1]Dixon vs. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F[2] 150 (1961).

[2]Buttney vs. Smiley 281 F. Supp. 280 (1968).

[3]Moore vs. Student Affairs Committee of Troy State University 284 F. Supp. 725 (1968).

marijuana. The court, as in the Moore case, held that the act was a proper exercise of the administrator's authority to maintain proper standards of conduct and discipline. The court did, however, suggest that, had the search been made by an officer of the law in pursuit of evidence for a criminal prosecution, greater constitutional requirements might have been imposed.[1]

The Moore case supported earlier restrictive decisions on the theory that a student has a special relationship with his school. The court did, however, set standards for a search that heretofore had not been established. Whereas, in the past, entry and search had been virtually at the whim of school authorities, it is now necessary for the authorities to show a "reasonable cause to believe" that a criminal offense had been committed or is in the offing. This standard does not encompass the more demanding general requirements of "probable cause" which is less speculative and tends to eliminate "fishing" expeditions but it points in the direction of the standard afforded all citizens.

State Statutory Requirement for Minimum Basic Training of Campus Security Officers

The national effort to upgrade law enforcement by requiring police recruits to undergo a basic training program has had minimal effect on the campus security officer.

---

[1]United States vs. Coles, 302 F. Supp. 90 (1969).

Appendix C, attached, describes the statutory requirements for the basic training of law enforcement officers and the special training available to campus security officers.

Thirty-three (33) states have created agencies to establish standards for employment and to provide training and educational opportunities for peace officers. Some of these general benefits have been received by the campus security officer but little training of a specialized nature has been made available. By statute, 26 of the states have mandatory laws, requiring the attendance of police recruits as a condition of employment. Seven (7) have voluntary programs in which there is no penalty for non-compliance. In some instances the state offers financial support to the police agencies as an inducement to their participation.

In the 26 mandatory training states, 9 do not accept campus security officers as qualified police officers eligible for training. Two (2) of the 7 voluntary training states also deny full police officer status to the campus security officer. Of the 11 states not recognizing campus security officers as full-fledged police officers, 5 states permit them to attend the training program on a voluntary, space available basis. It may be noted that the U.S. Congress in passing the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control Act allocated $6.5 million for a Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) that would provide scholarships for police officers. In its

implementation the U.S. Justice Department chose not to include non-deputized security officers in the recipient category.[1]

Only 2 of the states require or provide special training for campus security on a regular basis. New York with centralized state coordination has established an ongoing training program within the State University System (SUNY), and the 8 campuses of the University of Texas system have their own training academy.

Six (6) states have recently had special short-term training programs available for campus security personnel: The University of Illinois two-week Campus Training Institute, the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy voluntary seminars for private school security officers, the Eastern Kentucky University one-week Campus Security Workshop, the Maryland Army Reserve Unit's thirty-two hour Crowd Control course, the Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Academy one-week program, and the Utah Division of Peace Office Standards and Training 40 hour in-service Campus Security Course.

Administrative Rules and Policies Concerning the Role of the Campus Security Office in Campus Disorder Situations

Many institutions have prescribed rules and policies detailing the course of action required of personnel during

---

[1]William Caldwell, "Explanation of Certain Provisions in the Law Enforcement Education Program Manual," 11th Annual Conference Report, Intl. Assn. of College and University Directors, June 1969, p. 30.

disruptive student behavior. "Master Plans" detail the procedures and the sequence to be followed by the president, the dean of student affairs, the campus security officer and the other groups involved in responding to campus disorder.

To assist in the selection of questions to be used in the study questionnaire, a pre-study inquiry was made to 294 college and university presidents. The questions posed to them related specifically to the role allocated to campus security officers. Of the 152 responses 45 submitted formal, written "Master Plan" documents. An additional 25 described their "Master Plans" by letter and the balance indicated the lack of a formal plan but commented on the existence of certain policies concerning the role of the campus security officer.

Appendix D presents a summary of 25 selected "Master Plans" in terms of the campus security officer's duties and responsibilities at the onset of a disorder, the extent of his early command authority, his relationship to the students, and his relationship to outside police agencies. Inasmuch as several of the institutions requested that the "Master Plans" not be identified as to source, all are described by certain of their characteristics rather than by name. Comments offered from individuals will be identified by institutions and by title, unless otherwise requested.

The campus security officer role is small or great in these emergency situations depending on factors wholly within

the philosophy of the individual college. While a variety of techniques is displayed, an examination of the twenty-five master plans shows certain consultants in most institutions. Action decisions in policing situations are made by the president or his designee. Contact with the disruptive students is maintained generally by the dean of student affairs. Decision as to the need for outside forces is that of the chief administrator. The campus security officer is sometimes consulted in these situations. He usually performs ministerial tasks such as reading statements of law to students and notifying outside enforcement agencies of the president's request for assistance. In most instances the off-campus police forces assume tactical control of the policing situations, and campus security officers perform under their direction.

The sequence in which authority is used is concisely stated in a University of Maryland letter.[1]

> Our 'plan' contemplates four distinct steps to control campus disorders. The first two steps involve professional student affairs staff, the third step involves campus security personnel. Outside forces are brought in at the fourth and final step.

Some institutions provide for virtually no involvement of the campus security officer. At Bucknell,[2] for

---

[1]Letter, University of Maryland, Walter P. Waetjen, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, March 31, 1970.

[2]Letter, Bucknell University, John I. Zeller, Vice-President, Business, February 27, 1970.

example, "the officer understands that it is not his responsibility to deal with such an event (campus disorders) but to report it immediately to the appropriate student personnel officer." The California Institute of Technology[1] directs that, "In the event of such a disorder our security force is to stay out of sight." The University of Oregon position states clearly that "the campus security police will not be involved in any way with campus disorders."[2] A middle ground actively involves campus security but limits the extent of their discretion. At Princeton University,[3] only the president may call in outside police and our own security people are always in time of crisis under the immediate supervision of the Dean of Students." Oakland University[4] (Michigan) declares that "the only restriction placed on the Public Safety Office is that officers not become involved in a campus protest without authorization from the chancellor or the vice chancellor for student affairs."

Some fewer number of colleges offer greater decision-making authority to campus security officers. Tulane

---

[1]Letter, California Institute of Technology, Hardy Martel, Executive Assistant to the President, February 26, 1970.

[2]Letter, University of Oregon, Gerald K. Goben, Assistant to Dean of Administration, March 19, 1970.

[3]Letter, Princeton University, Neil L. Rudenstine, Dean of Students, March 9, 1970.

[4]Letter, Oakland University, Thomas B. Dutton, Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs, March 11, 1970.

University[1] gives "full discretionary power to the Security Officer including the request for outside assistance." The University of Tennessee[2] reports that "their plan contemplates bringing in outside forces when in the judgment of the Director of Safety and Security, he has insufficient force to effectively deal with a campus disorder."

Among institutions which have formulated "Master Plans" the duties and responsibilities of campus security forces at the onset of disturbances are generally to alert all police forces on and off campus, to make arrests only when absolutely necessary, to establish command and communications centers, to gather evidence by photos and other means, to patrol key buildings, and to be available for further decisions of the administration. These narrowly prescribed functions are derived from philosophical as well as practical considerations. The desire to avoid even the appearance of force on campus and the uncertainty as to the ability of the security officer tend to result in his assignment to what is manifestly a secondary role. Rider College President, Frank B. Elliot,[3] pointed up one aspect of the problem in his letter:

---

[1]Letter, Tulane University, Clarence Scheps, Executive Vice President, April 15, 1970.

[2]Letter, University of Tennessee, James E. Drinnon, Jr., General Counsel, March 4, 1970.

[3]Letter, Rider College, Frank B. Elliot, President, March 3, 1970.

> A Campus security office is quite different from a police force and staffing requires careful consideration in order to get men who will have the flexibility to distinguish between actionable violations, high spirits, and pardonable indiscretion--no small order.

A letter from Lewis and Clark College[1] is perhaps more direct on the same point:

> We have the difficulty in recruiting staff that understand that you work with students in a counselling, friendly way rather than by bullying them with authority.

A University of Montana[2] letter describes the essential nature of their security force as never having included any activities usually anticipated of a peace officer because "any such effective change will require the introduction of police power to the campus."

The "Master Plan" institutions are also in agreement that the extent of campus security "early command" authority be extremely limited. Almost all require an administration effort prior to the involvement of campus security. At Harvard University,[3] "administrative directives issue from an ad hoc committee so that no untoward actions are taken to escalate the unrest." In situations where campus security may take command after the administrators have failed to quell

---

[1]Letter, Lewis and Clark College, Kent Hawley, Vice-President for Student Affairs, March 25, 1970.

[2]Letter, University of Montana, George L. Mitchell, Vice-President for Administration, March 2, 1970.

[3]Letter, Harvard University, George Ward, Jr., Director, Physical Plant, March 11, 1970.

the disorder, they often continue to remain subject to student personnel officers and other groups.

Most of the "Master Plans" permit a rather circumscribed involvement between campus security officers and students at demonstration scenes. A majority utilizes the campus security for the purpose of notifying students that they may be in violation of the law. Efforts at serious conciliation appear to be confined to the administrators.

The final area surveyed in the examination of "Master Plans" shows the campus security officer relationship to outside police agencies. Although the decision to call in outside forces is primarily a presidential one, the campus security assumes a major role as liaison and as a supplementary back-up force for the off-campus law enforcement agencies. In some situations, the campus security office will maintain command or a joint effort will be attempted. The choice between relinquishing control to outside forces and concern over the inability of internal forces to cope with the situation creates a serious decision-making problem. Often-times security officers are the sole contact with off-campus forces. Differing attitudes are expressed in letter comments:

State University of New York, Buffalo:[1]

---

[1]Letter, State University of N.Y., Buffalo, Robert E. Hunt, Director of Security, March 26, 1970.

Within the last few days we have had as many as 400 city police on campus twenty-four hours a day. The first sign of a mass demonstration is the time to call in sufficient numbers of municipal officers to contain the demonstration and prevent any 'testing' of the University will.

University of Kansas:[1]

Our plan contemplates bringing in outside forces only at the point at which all other methods to ameliorate the situations have failed.

Harvard University:[2]

The University Police have authority to call upon the Cambridge Police in the event that it is necessary to prevent serious bodily harm to any person or to prevent serious damage to property, but the numbers (of outside police) brought in without further authority would be seriously limited.

University of Minnesota:[3]

We seek strong liaison with external law enforcement agencies. This includes the assumption that we are responsible within the campus perimeters and that action adjacent to these perimeters will be cooperative.

Montana State University:[4]

It would be advantageous if the campus security chief could call in only a limited number of city police to act under his control.

San Fernando Valley State College:[5]

---

[1]Letter, University of Kansas, R. K. Lawton, Vice Chancellor for Operations, March 20, 1970.

[2]Letter, Harvard University, Archibald Cox, Dean of Harvard Law School, March 6, 1970.

[3]Letter, University of Minnesota, Eileen McAvoy, Administrative Assistant to President, February 27, 1970.

[4]Letter, Montana State University, Lawrence Waldoch, Administrative Assistant to President, March 5, 1970.

[5]Letter, San Fernando Valley State College, H. F. Spencer, Vice President, Administrative Affairs, March 11, 1970.

> The Los Angeles Police Department will not be coming to the campus without having been asked or if they feel they should come, they will contact the administrative officers, prior to their appearance.

Chapter Summary and Conclusions

The legal posture of the campus security office offers the same uncertainty as is suggested in its unsettled historical origins. The legislature has been hesitant to create a full-fledged enforcement officer on campus, and the educational institutions have been wary to delegate the authority they possess. There are few standards established by law for employment among state colleges and virtually none among private colleges. Authority has generally been derived in the past through deputization, and until the law becomes more firm, this practice will probably continue. An examination of the Master Plans of 25 colleges and universities detailing the precise duties to be performed in a major campus disorder situation shows the security officer as having a limited and proscribed role. His main function is to serve as liaison between the administration and the off-campus police.

The limited legal support offered by the legislature and the confining policies provided by the educational institution portend a restrained and a restricted campus security operation.

CHAPTER IV

OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS

The history and the legal structuring of the campus security position in each of the states have produced a variety of responsibilities. Variables such as the enrollment, the types of institutional control, and the academic level have further influenced the duties assigned to the office. Despite this, there are also many uniformities visible in the organizational structure and in the relationships among components of the educational institution and with outside police forces.

A questionnaire submitted to 245 campus security directors, as to their duties and relationships, brought 210 responses. The results of the questionnaire were recorded in tables by percentages according to the total numerical responses for each variable. The respondents were permitted to check as many items as apply in each question, and therefore each of the items is treated independently for the purpose of computing the percentage of those responding affirmatively.

The characteristics of the responding institutions are listed in Table 1. Geographically, there were 13 schools from the Southeast, 57 from the Midwest, and 32 schools from the

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATIONS OF 210 RESPONDING COLLEGES ACCORDING TO TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND ENROLLMENT

	Total Schools (N=210)	Total Percentage Response	Type of Institutional Control	
			Private	Public
Institutional Control				
Private	71	33.7	--	--
Public	139	66.3	--	--
Academic Level				
Junior College	14	6.6	14.3	85.7
Four Year College	76	36.2	44.5	55.5
Graduate School	120	57.2	29.4	70.6
Enrollment				
Under 5,000	54	25.7	70.3	29.7
5,000-9,999	67	31.8	26.8	73.2
10,000-14,999	34	16.2	17.6	82.4
15,000-19,999	27	12.9	18.5	81.5
Over 20,000	28	13.4	14.3	85.7

Farwestern states. There were also 35 schools from the South and 24 schools from Southwestern states.

Personnel Characteristics

The profile of the campus security officer gains visibility through an examination of the conditions surrounding his employment. His kinship to the municipal police officer permits comparison between the two forces in terms of the manner in which each uses its manpower.

The number of full-time security officers employed at institutions of higher learning, as seen in Table 2, can be compared with employment ratios among municipal police agencies by examining data from the "Uniform Crime Reports" of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).[1] These data describe the local manpower average as 1.3 municipal police officers available per 1,000 population among cities having less than fifty thousand inhabitants. The comparison shows both smaller and larger institutions as having employment ratios in ranges similar to those of the municipalities.

In comparison with the FBI data, colleges in the under 5,000 population bracket would employ an average 6.7 security officers. Table 2 shows 35.0 percent of the 54 colleges in the 5,000 and under population bracket as having less than 5

---

[1]The President's Commission Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: The Police, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967, p. 8.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS EMPLOYED FULL-TIME, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

	Total Schools (N=210)	Size of Security Force					
		0	1-4	5-9	10-24	25-49	50-99
Total Percentage	210	1.4	11.7	21.1	39.0	18.3	7.0
Type of Control							
Private	71	1.4	21.0	25.8	21.0	21.0	9.8
Public	139	1.4	7.2	19.5	48.9	17.3	5.7
Academic Level							
Two Year	14	14.3	28.6	42.8	14.3	00.0	00.0
Four Year	76	1.3	18.4	23.6	45.0	11.7	00.0
Graduate	120	0.0	6.7	18.5	37.9	24.2	12.6
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	1.5	33.6	38.9	24.0	2.0	00.0
5,000-9,999	67	1.4	7.5	29.9	41.9	16.4	2.9
10,000-14,999	34	2.9	0.0	11.8	64.7	14.7	5.9
15,000-19,999	27	0.0	7.3	3.7	48.2	37.0	3.7
Over 20,000	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.5	42.8	35.7

officers, 39.0 percent of the colleges having 5-9 officers, 24.0 percent of the colleges having 10-24 officers and 2.0 percent with 25-49 officers.

Using the FBI figures, colleges in the 15,000 to 19,999 population grouping should have approximately 20 to 25

security officers to match the local police level. There are 27 colleges in that population grouping. Eleven (11.0) percent employ 9 or less officers, 48.0 percent have 10-24 officers, and 41.0 percent employ over 25 security officers. The results show similar employment levels for both population groupings at institutions of higher education and at municipal police agencies.

Part-time officers, students and women are not used to any large extent to supplement the security staff. Of the 71 private colleges, 50.0 percent have no part-time officers, and among the 139 public colleges, 67.0 percent have no part-time officers. See Table 3.

The use of students as campus security officers has even less acceptance than part-time personnel. See Table 4. Seventy-three (73.0) percent of the private institutions and 70.0 percent of the public institutions do not employ students. Only 8 private schools and 19 public schools employ 5 or more students.

Female security officers are virtually non-existent on campus. See Table 5. Eighty-seven (87.0) percent of the private colleges and 76.0 percent of the public colleges employ no women as security officers. Only 4 schools have as many as 9 female officers, and 3 of those are in the population category of over 15,000.

The academic background of campus security officers is shown in Table 6. Ninety-one (91.0) percent of the private

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF PART-TIME SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

	Total Schools (N=210)	Size of Part-time Security Force					
		0	1-4	5-9	10-24	25-49	50-90
Total Percentage	210	60.6	21.1	8.5	6.1	2.0	.5
Type of Control							
Private	71	50.4	33.7	5.7	5.7	4.4	0.0
Public	139	66.9	15.2	10.0	6.5	0.7	0.7
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	42.9	35.7	7.2	14.2	0.0	0.0
Four Years	76	51.2	30.2	9.4	7.9	1.3	0.0
Graduate	120	69.5	14.4	8.5	4.2	2.6	0.8
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	48.1	37.0	9.2	3.8	1.9	0.0
5,000-9,999	67	65.7	19.4	10.4	4.5	0.0	0.0
10,000-14,999	34	64.7	23.6	2.9	5.9	2.9	0.0
15,000-19,999	27	63.0	7.4	14.8	14.8	0.0	0.0
Over 20,000	28	71.5	7.1	3.6	7.1	7.1	3.6

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS EMPLOYED AS CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

	Total Schools (N=210)	Number of Student Security Officers				
		0	1-4	5-9	10-24	25-49
Total Percentage	210	70.0	16.0	6.5	2.8	3.8
Type of Control						
Private	71	73.0	15.8	5.6	2.8	2.8
Public	139	69.7	16.5	7.1	2.8	3.6
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	57.1	35.8	0.0	7.1	0.0
Four Years	76	77.5	14.7	3.9	2.6	1.3
Graduate	120	68.7	15.0	9.3	2.5	4.5
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	74.0	13.0	11.1	0.0	1.9
5,000-9,999	67	68.6	20.9	7.5	1.5	1.5
10,000-14,999	34	58.9	32.3	2.9	5.9	0.0
15,000-19,999	27	81.6	7.4	3.7	3.7	3.7
Over 20,000	28	75.0	0.0	3.6	7.1	14.3

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN EMPLOYED AS CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TYPE INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY EMPLOYMENT

	Total Schools (N=210)	Number of Women Security Officers		
		0	1-4	5-9
Total Percentage	210	78.9	17.8	1.8
Type of Control				
Private	71	87.2	11.6	1.4
Public	139	76.2	21.6	2.2
Academic Level				
Two Years	14	71.4	28.6	0.0
Four Years	76	85.4	13.3	1.3
Graduate	120	77.5	20.0	2.5
Enrollment				
Under 5,000	54	90.7	7.4	1.9
5,000-9,999	67	77.6	22.4	0.0
10,000-14,999	34	85.3	14.7	0.0
15,000-19,999	27	85.2	11.1	3.7
Over 20,000	28	53.6	39.3	7.1

TABLE 6

AVERAGE SCHOOL YEARS COMPLETED BY CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

	Total Schools (N=210)	Years of Schooling					
		Under 8	8	10	12	14	16 & Over
Total Percentage	210	.5	1.4	10.3	75.2	9.9	1.4
Type of Control							
Private	71	1.4	1.4	18.5	70.3	8.4	0.0
Public	139	0.0	1.4	6.5	79.1	10.8	2.2
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	0.0	0.0	7.5	78.3	14.2	0.0
Four Years	76	1.3	2.6	10.5	76.4	9.2	0.0
Graduate	120	0.0	0.8	10.8	76.7	9.2	2.5
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	1.8	5.5	13.0	70.5	9.2	0.0
5,000-9,999	67	0.0	0.0	12.0	80.5	7.5	0.0
10,000-14,999	34	0.0	0.0	8.8	82.3	8.8	0.0
15,000-19,999	27	0.0	0.0	7.4	74.1	18.5	0.0
Over 20,000	28	0.0	0.0	7.1	67.9	14.3	10.7

colleges and 85.0 percent of the public colleges have campus security personnel with the average equivalent of a high school diploma or less. This is comparable to the median level of 12.4 years of education completed by police officers as indicated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare[1] in 1966. Eleven (11.0) percent of the total number of colleges had officers averaging some college education as compared to 24.0 percent in a national survey[2] of 6,300 police officers.

Despite the tendency of institutions of higher learning to hire "retired" police officers the average age of campus security officers is higher than that of the municipal police only at private institutions. See Table 7. Thirty-two (32.0) percent of the private colleges and 40.0 percent of the public colleges have staffs within the preferred average age range of 21-35 years. The U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Report[3] shows 41.0 percent of municipal police personnel in that bracket. Twenty-four (24.0) percent of the private colleges and 12.0 percent of the public colleges have personnel with average ages between 48-60 years.

The campus security officer has employment benefits which generally provide a paid vacation and a retirement

---

[1] Ibid., p. 10.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

TABLE 7

AVERAGE AGE OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

	Total Schools (N=210)	Age of Security Officers			
		Under 20	20-35	36-47	48-60
Total Percentage	210	.5	37.1	45.1	16.0
Type of Control					
Private	71	1.4	32.5	42.2	23.9
Public	139	0.0	40.3	47.5	12.2
Academic Level					
Two Years	14	0.0	28.6	50.0	21.4
Four Years	76	1.3	34.2	43.4	21.1
Graduate	120	0.0	40.0	47.5	12.5
Enrollment					
Under 5,000	54	1.8	22.2	46.2	29.5
5,000-9,999	67	0.0	37.4	46.2	16.4
10,000-14,999	34	0.0	50.0	41.2	8.8
15,000-19,999	27	0.0	33.4	51.8	14.8
Over 20,000	28	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0

pension. See Table 8. Only 5.0 percent of the institutions do not offer paid vacations and all but 13.0 percent have a retirement pension plan. The private institutions and the small institutions are more prone to omit pension plans. Twenty-five (25.0) percent of the private institutions and over 31.0 percent of the institutions in the under 5,000 population bracket have no retirement plans. Civil services advantages are provided by 24.0 percent of the colleges and 20.0 percent offer the benefits of high hazard insurance, which accelerates pension and disability benefits in the event of injury suffered in the line of duty.

Employment conditions at particular institutions are susceptible to evaluation by comparison with nearby police installations. Campus security officers were asked to determine the certain advantages that they had over local police. Their responses, as seen in Table 9, suggested virtually no campus security officer advantages. In the area of salary, a total of 16.0 percent cited their range as higher than that of the local police with only 7.0 percent of the private colleges in that group. The suggestion that campus security had higher employment standards found concurrence with but 17.0 percent of the respondents and only 6.0 percent were in the below 5,000 population category. The issue of better equipment found 16.0 percent believing that they had better equipment than the local police. In the population bracket of schools below 5,000, four (4.0)

TABLE 8

EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Employment Benefits	Total Schools (N=210)	Paid Vacation	Retirement Pension	Civil Service	High Hazard Insurance
Total Percentage	210	95.4	86.5	24.0	19.8
Type of Control					
Private	71	96.6	74.6	9.8	19.6
Public	139	93.5	93.5	31.6	20.1
Academic Level					
Two Years	14	71.4	57.1	21.4	21.4
Four Years	76	98.3	83.8	32.3	26.6
Graduate	120	98.3	93.3	25.8	17.5
Enrollment					
Under 5,000	54	96.2	68.6	11.1	22.2
5,000-9,999	67	89.4	96.9	26.9	22.4
10,000-14,999	34	94.2	91.2	29.4	11.8
15,000-19,999	27	96.2	88.8	33.3	14.8
Over 20,000	28	100.0	100.0	28.6	25.0

TABLE 9

PERCEPTIONS BY CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS OF THEIR ADVANTAGES OVER THE LOCAL POLICE, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Advantages Over Local Police	Total Schools (N=210)	Higher Salary	Higher Employment Standards	Better Equipment	More Experienced Personnel	Less Turnover	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	16.0	17.0	15.6	9.8	31.0	51.1	4.7
Type of Control								
Private	71	7.0	5.6	11.2	5.6	7.0	77.0	1.4
Public	139	20.9	23.0	18.0	12.2	43.9	40.3	6.5
Academic Level								
Two Years	14	7.1	0.0	7.1	7.1	21.4	64.3	7.1
Four Years	76	14.4	0.0	13.1	5.2	28.8	56.3	3.9
Graduate	120	18.3	22.5	18.3	12.8	34.2	49.1	4.5
Enrollment								
Under 5,000	54	9.2	5.6	3.7	1.8	11.1	75.9	1.8
5,000-9,999	67	22.3	23.8	23.8	17.9	41.8	44.7	1.5
10,000-14,999	34	20.6	14.7	14.7	14.7	47.0	38.2	6.0
15,000-19,999	27	3.7	7.4	18.5	3.7	33.3	51.8	7.4
Over 20,000	28	21.4	35.7	17.8	7.1	25.0	42.8	14.2

percent supported the proposition of having better equipment.

The statement that campus security personnel were more experienced than local police found agreement among only 10.0 percent of the colleges. Private colleges with 6.0 percent in agreement showed especially low support, but the over 15,000 population groupings also had no more than 6.0 percent support. Fifty-one (51.0) percent of the colleges failed to find any advantages whatsoever in comparison with the local police. Seventy-seven (77.0) percent of these were private and 40.0 percent were public institutions.

The need for additional campus security personnel to adequately perform their function was the basis of a question requesting specific reasons for this need. The key responses (Table 10) were perhaps the small number, 12.0 percent, who found no increase in the campus security staff necessary. Forty-three (43.0) percent of the private colleges and 84.0 percent of the public colleges attributed the need to a larger student body. Seventy-one (71.0) percent supported a staff increase on the basis that they now have more buildings to patrol and 60.0 percent on the grounds that there were more vehicles on campus. The rise in the individual crime rate on campus prompted 53.0 percent to indicate a need for more personnel. Student protest drew a lesser 33.0 percent who described its presence as requiring an increase in the campus security force. In the population bracket of under 5,000 only 8.0 percent of the colleges viewed campus protest as a

TABLE 10

REASONS GIVEN BY CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS FOR NEEDING TO INCREASE THE SECURITY STAFF, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Reasons for Staff Increase	Total Schools (N=210)	No Increase Necessary	More Students	More Bldgs.	More Autos	Crime Rise	Student Protest	Other
Total Percentage	210	11.7	69.6	71.4	60.4	52.6	32.9	3.7
Type of Control								
Private	71	18.4	43.4	57.4	44.8	58.8	28.0	4.4
Public	139	8.6	84.1	79.8	69.7	50.3	36.0	3.6
Academic Level								
Two Years	14	28.6	57.1	50.0	50.0	28.6	7.1	7.1
Four Years	76	13.1	65.5	69.4	60.2	45.8	23.6	2.6
Graduate	120	9.2	71.1	77.8	62.8	60.8	41.6	4.2
Enrollment								
Under 5,000	54	24.0	48.1	59.2	46.2	35.1	7.5	3.7
5,000-9,999	67	5.9	76.0	82.0	76.0	58.1	35.7	1.5
10,000-14,999	34	8.8	73.5	64.8	76.4	52.9	29.4	6.0
15,000-19,999	27	11.1	85.1	77.7	59.2	48.1	55.5	3.7
Over 20,000	28	3.6	32.1	71.4	46.4	85.7	60.7	7.1

basis for staff increase while in the population bracket over 20,000, sixty-one (61.0) percent considered it a threat warranting greater security precautions.

Excluding the under 5,000 bracket and combining the population brackets within the 5,000 to 15,000 population and then comparing them to the population in the brackets over 15,000 shows less pronounced differences than is evident at the population extremes. In the item offering the rise of individual crime as a reason for increasing the staff there is an 11.0 percent difference between the under 5,000 bracket and the over 20,000 bracket. The greater disparity at the population extremes is evident in virtually all the items in this question.

The Availability and Use of Specialized Training and Equipment

The level of enforcement efficiency displayed by security officers is dependent upon the supportive resources that are available. Training facilities, specialists, modern equipment, and administrative direction are all necessary elements.

Recruit training is a requirement among 55.0 percent of the colleges. See Table 11. Forty-one (41.0) percent of the private colleges and 64.0 percent of the public colleges make training for new officers compulsory. In the below 5,000 population bracket, 33.0 percent have such program

TABLE 11

REQUIRED TRAINING FOR CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Required Training	Total Schools (N=210)	Recruit Training	In-Service Training	Riot Control	Student Behavior	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	55.5	84.1	40.4	34.8	10.4	9.9
Type of Control							
Private	71	40.6	79.8	14.0	30.8	15.4	7.0
Public	139	64.0	86.3	54.6	37.4	7.9	11.5
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	35.7	78.5	21.4	21.4	21.4	0.0
Four Years	76	47.2	77.2	37.9	35.3	15.7	5.2
Graduate	120	64.1	90.8	45.0	36.6	5.8	14.1
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	33.3	70.3	9.2	18.5	25.9	1.8
5,000-9,999	67	56.6	84.9	41.7	29.8	8.9	11.9
10,000-14,999	34	58.8	88.2	51.7	50.0	6.0	8.8
15,000-19,999	27	62.9	100.0	51.8	44.4	0.0	3.7
Over 20,000	28	100.0	100.0	74.2	53.5	0.0	28.5

while in the over 20,000 population bracket, the 28 colleges show a 100.0 percent requirement.

In-service training is required at 84.0 percent of the institutions. Seventy (70.0) percent in the below 5,000 population bracket provide continuing training for their security officers as do 11 of the 14 junior colleges.

Riot control as a training program has found some acceptance at the public colleges but considerable less at the private colleges. Fifty-five (55.0) percent of the public colleges and only 14.0 percent of the private colleges afford their staffs training in such mass disorder techniques.

Training for campus security officers in student behavior is conducted at 35.0 percent of the campuses in the study population. Schools in the population brackets below 10,000, number 25.0 percent who require this training while those requiring it in the population brackets over 10,000 constitute 50.0 percent of the schools. Twenty-two schools (22) responded that they required no training and, of these, 14 were in the under 5,000 population bracket.

A considerable portion of the day-to-day routine of the campus security officer may be taken up with duties not normally ascribed to a protective or peace keeping function. See Table 12. The extent of these non-police duties may suggest more of a service function than an enforcement role. Lost and found duties are the responsibility of 51.0 percent of the campus security officers, and ambulance service is

TABLE 12

NON-POLICING DUTIES OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Non-Policing Duties	Total Schools (N=210)	Lost & Found	Ambulance Service	Key Control	Fire Service	Other
Total Percentage	210	51.2	42.8	34.8	40.4	13.6
Type of Control						
Private	71	54.6	36.4	43.4	44.8	14.0
Public	139	50.3	46.7	28.7	38.8	12.9
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	28.5	21.4	21.4	21.4	21.4
Four Years	76	52.4	37.9	41.9	48.5	10.5
Graduate	120	54.1	49.1	32.5	37.8	14.2
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	53.6	35.1	44.4	46.2	12.9
5,000-9,999	67	56.6	41.7	38.7	46.2	4.5
10,000-14,999	34	55.8	44.1	26.4	52.9	14.7
15,000-19,999	27	37.0	55.5	22.2	29.6	18.5
Over 20,000	28	46.4	53.5	32.1	14.3	28.5

supplied on 43.0 percent of the campuses. Key control, the handling and storing of all school seys, is a campus security function at 35.0 percent of the schools. An additional 14.0 percent describe other non-police chores, mainly transporting V.I.P.'s, making bank deposits, and serving as an information center.

The limited use of department specialists is perhaps best evidenced by 62.0 percent of the respondents who indicated that they employed no specialists. See Table 13. Only 17.0 percent had a narcotic expert on staff, 10.0 percent had full-time undercover agents, and 2.0 percent had a vice officer specialist. Among the 17.0 percent describing other specialists, there were several indications that the chief security officer was able to assume the necessary specialist duties as they arose. The lack of specialist use was most pronounced at the smaller institutions where negative responses were received from 85.0 percent in the under 5,000 population bracket and from 69.0 percent in the 5,000 to 9,999 population.

A vital aspect of a policing function is the obtaining of reliable information. This enables early deterrent action, affords an opportunity properly to amass evidence, and permits a planned and realistic use of available resources. The undercover agent and intelligence sources are the instrumentalities through which valid information is obtained. See Table 14.

TABLE 13

DEPARTMENT SPECIALISTS EMPLOYED IN CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICES, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Specialists Employed	Total Schools (N=210)	None	Narcotics Expert	Undercover Agent	Vice Officer	Other
Total Percentage	210	61.6	17.4	10.3	1.9	17.4
Type of Control						
Private	71	70.0	12.6	8.4	1.4	15.4
Public	139	58.2	20.1	11.5	2.2	18.7
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	78.5	0.0	7.1	0.0	7.1
Four Years	76	74.7	11.7	7.8	0.0	10.5
Graduate	120	52.5	23.3	12.5	3.3	23.3
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	85.1	5.5	5.5	0.0	9.2
5,000-9,999	67	69.0	15.0	6.0	3.0	12.0
10,000-14,999	34	54.1	17.6	20.6	3.0	26.4
15,000-19,999	27	59.2	22.2	18.5	3.7	14.8
Over 20,000	28	28.5	42.8	10.7	0.0	39.3

TABLE 14

SOURCE OF UNDERCOVER AGENTS FOR CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Source of Agents	Total Schools (N=210)	None	Outside Police	Regular Staff	Student Body	Other
Total Percentage	210	31.0	44.7	24.5	20.2	6.1
Type of Control						
Private	71	44.8	35.0	18.4	15.8	2.8
Public	139	24.4	50.3	28.0	23.0	7.9
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	28.5	42.9	14.3	7.1	7.1
Four Years	76	35.4	36.7	24.8	23.6	4.0
Graduate	120	29.1	50.8	25.8	18.3	7.5
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	46.2	29.6	13.0	20.3	5.5
5,000-9,999	67	25.3	53.6	28.3	20.8	4.5
10,000-14,999	34	26.5	38.2	29.4	20.5	2.9
15,000-19,999	27	26.0	59.2	14.8	25.9	11.1
Over 20,000	28	28.5	50.0	42.8	14.3	10.7

Forty-five (45.0) percent of the private colleges and 24.0 percent of the public colleges do not use undercover agents. The largest source of undercover agents are the off-campus police agencies who provide agents for 35.0 percent of the private colleges and for 50.0 percent of the public colleges. Members of the regular security staff act as undercover agents for a specific assignment at 18.0 percent of the private colleges and at 28.0 percent of the public colleges. Students are used to inform on their fellows at 16.0 percent of the private colleges and at 23.0 percent of the public colleges.

Combining again the brackets within the 5,000 to 15,000 population and comparing them to the total population over 15,000, we find these groups within 1.0 percentage point of each other, while the under 5,000 population bracket and the over 20,000 population bracket show from 6.0 to 20.0 percent difference among the same items.

Intelligence sources are primarily outside police agencies but the other institutions and informants also are contributors. See Table 15. Sixty-eight (68.0) percent of the private schools and 92.0 percent of the public schools avail themselves of intelligence from outside police agencies. Intelligence gathered by informants is used at 53.0 percent of the of the private schools and at 76.0 percent of the public schools. Other institutions offer intelligence to 39.0 percent of the private schools and 62.0 percent of the

TABLE 15

SOURCE OF INTELLIGENCE FOR CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Source of Intelligence	Total Schools (N=210)	Outside Police	Inform-ants	Other Schools	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	83.7	66.7	53.6	9.9	8.5
Type of Control						
Private	71	68.4	53.2	39.2	19.6	5.6
Public	139	92.3	76.2	61.8	5.0	10.0
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	64.2	42.8	28.5	28.5	0.0
Four Years	76	79.9	62.8	48.5	13.1	6.5
Graduate	120	82.2	75.0	60.8	9.2	10.8
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	70.3	55.5	42.5	20.3	9.2
5,000-9,999	67	92.4	70.0	55.1	7.4	10.4
10,000-14,999	34	88.2	79.4	64.8	3.0	8.8
15,000-19,999	27	92.5	70.3	55.5	7.4	0.0
Over 20,000	28	85.7	75.0	60.7	7.1	10.7

public schools. A comparison between the below 5,000 population bracket and the over 20,000 bracket shows the latter with a 16.0 to 21.0 percent greater use of intelligence in each of the areas noted. Comparing the 5,000 to 15,000 population brackets with the over 15,000 population brackets we find a less than 2.0 percent difference in each of the categories.

The kinds of equipment in use for normal operations and the availability of equipment for emergency situations determine to a great extent the operational capability of the campus security officer. See Table 16. The portable communication device known as the "walkie talkie" has found general acceptance on campus. Ninety-one (91.0) percent of all colleges utilize this instrument. The student photo I.D. card is found on 70.0 percent of the campuses. The automatic burglar alarm is reported by 45.0 percent of the colleges and is in use in ascending increase according to population brackets. The under 5,000 bracket shows a 19.0 percent use, the 5,000-9,999 bracket has a 43.0 percent use, the 10,000-14,999 bracket has 50.0 percent use, the 15,000-19,999 bracket has a 68.0 percent use, and the over 20,000 population bracket has a 79.0 percent use of automatic burglar alarms.

Sophisticated detection instruments such as a closed circuit television net or telephone recording devices are not commonplace on campuses. Less than 10.0 percent of the total

TABLE 16

SECURITY EQUIPMENT USED IN CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Security Equipment In Use	Total Schools (N=210)	Walkie Talkie	Student Photo I.D.	Automatic Burglar Alarm	TV Closed Circuit	Telephone Recording Device
Total Percentage	210	90.7	69.6	45.1	9.4	14.1
Type of Control						
Private	71	89.6	68.6	47.6	8.4	15.4
Public	139	92.0	71.2	44.6	10.0	13.7
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	85.6	50.0	42.8	7.1	21.4
Four Years	76	89.0	78.6	31.4	1.3	13.1
Graduate	120	94.1	67.2	53.3	15.0	14.1
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	88.8	74.0	18.5	1.8	5.5
5,000-9,999	67	89.4	68.5	43.2	7.4	14.9
10,000-14,999	34	97.0	73.5	50.0	14.7	17.6
15,000-19,999	27	92.5	74.0	67.6	0.0	14.8
Over 20,000	28	100.0	60.7	78.5	32.1	25.0

number of schools use closed circuit television, and 90.0 percent of these are graduate schools.

The telephone recording devices used for eavesdropping are present at 14.0 percent of the total 210 colleges and universities. No particular population category appears to dominate in this area.

The availability of chemical properties such as tear gas, mace and pepper fogger to subdue unruly campus crowds raises many philosophical questions concerning the relationship between security officer and student but from a policing point of view it is also significant.

Sixty-four (64.0) percent of the private colleges and 36.0 percent of the public colleges report no crowd control equipment available. See Table 17. Sixty-one (61.0) percent in the under 5,000 bracket and 21.0 percent in the over 20,000 bracket are also in that category as are 71.0 percent of the junior colleges. Thirteen (13.0) percent of the private colleges and 37.0 percent of the public colleges have tear gas available, while 26.0 percent of the private colleges and 55.0 percent of the public colleges have mace available. Pepper fogger, a more recent addition to the chemical armament array, is only available at 4.0 percent of the schools.

Relationships with Other Components on Campus

The involvement of the campus security officer in the affairs of the institution and his acceptance as an integral

TABLE 17

CROWD CONTROL EQUIPMENT AVAILABLE TO CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Control Equipment	Total Schools (N=210)	None	Tear Gas	Mace	Pepper Fogger	Other
Total Percentage	210	45.1	28.2	44.7	3.7	8.5
Type of Control						
Private	71	64.4	12.6	25.6	1.4	5.6
Public	139	36.0	36.6	55.3	5.0	10.0
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	71.4	21.4	21.4	7.1	14.2
Four Years	76	51.0	19.6	40.6	2.6	9.2
Graduate	120	39.1	35.0	50.8	4.1	7.5
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	61.0	20.3	33.3	0.0	3.7
5,000-9,999	67	47.7	22.3	46.2	4.5	4.5
10,000-14,999	34	41.1	23.5	44.1	2.9	14.7
15,000-19,999	27	40.7	37.0	51.8	7.4	11.1
Over 20,000	28	21.4	57.1	60.7	7.1	17.8

part of the college community derive from the extent and quality of his relationships with the educational and administrative components.

The campus security office participates fully in administrative policy making at the enforcement and emergency situation level but has only minimal involvement in student conduct within the academic setting. See Table 18. The office is active in the promulgation of traffic regulations as reflected in the total of 93.0 percent reporting this involvement. Mass disorder strategy includes 72.0 percent in the planning, and catastrophic events involve 60.0 percent of the security offices. In each of these areas the public college percentage is somewhat higher than that of the private colleges.

In the areas more directly concerned with the disposition of individual student conduct, the security officers report policy-making involvement in only 18.0 percent of student discipline decisions and an only 16.0 percent involvement in the development of student codes of conduct.

Beyond the area of participating in policy making, the campus security office has a limited contact on a regular basis with certain of the other components of the educational institution. See Table 19. The campus security office meets more frequently with committees of the administration and with the office of student affairs than with either faculty or student committees. Sixty-one (61.0) percent meet

TABLE 18

CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE PARTICIPATION IN POLICY-MAKING AREAS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Policy Making Participation	Total School (N=210)	Traffic Regulations	Mass Disorder Strategy	Catastrophic Events	Student Discipline	Student Code of Conduct
Total Percentage	210	92.6	71.9	60.2	18.3	16.4
Type of Control						
Private	71	89.6	58.8	49.0	16.8	14.0
Public	139	95.6	79.8	66.9	19.4	18.0
Academic Level						
Two Years	14	92.8	71.4	50.0	21.4	14.3
Four Years	76	94.3	59.0	45.8	19.6	18.3
Graduate	120	93.3	81.6	71.1	17.5	15.8
Enrollment						
Under 5,000	54	94.3	55.5	48.1	25.9	24.0
5,000-9,999	67	95.3	79.0	65.5	12.0	13.4
10,000-14,999	34	94.2	73.5	55.9	17.6	8.8
15,000-19,999	27	96.2	77.7	62.9	14.8	11.1
Over 20,000	28	89.2	85.7	78.5	25.0	25.0

TABLE 19

REGULARLY HELD MEETINGS BETWEEN CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE AND SCHOOL COMMITTEES, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

School Committees	Total Schools (N=210)	Adminis-tration	Dean of Students	Faculty	Student Body	Joint Comm.	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	61.1	57.4	23.4	24.5	41.4	16.4	7.5
Type of Control								
Private	71	60.4	57.4	14.0	18.4	39.2	21.0	4.4
Public	139	62.5	58.3	28.7	28.0	47.1	14.4	9.3
Academic Level								
Two Years	14	57.1	35.7	21.4	14.3	21.4	28.5	7.1
Four Years	76	55.0	57.6	19.6	21.0	34.0	21.0	3.9
Graduate	120	66.6	60.8	26.6	28.3	49.1	12.5	10.0
Enrollment								
Under 5,000	54	51.8	72.1	14.8	16.6	33.3	20.3	5.5
5,000-9,999	67	69.5	52.1	25.3	26.9	37.2	17.8	8.9
10,000-14,999	34	58.8	70.5	17.6	20.6	38.2	11.7	8.8
15,000-19,999	27	62.9	59.2	25.9	25.9	44.4	25.9	11.1
Over 20,000	28	75.0	60.7	42.8	42.8	71.4	7.1	3.6

regularly with the administration, and 57.0 percent meet regularly with the office of student affairs. Only 23.0 percent hold scheduled meetings with the faculty, and but 25.0 percent are in periodic contact with student committees. Schools in the below 5,000 population bracket meet with faculty and students at a level of 15.0 percent and 17.0 percent respectively, while those in the over 20,000 population bracket meet regularly with the faculty and with the student committees at 43.0 percent of the colleges.

The regular committee meetings held with the office of student affairs are carried over in most part to the exchange of information concerning troublesome and troubled students. See Table 20. Regular exchanges between the two departments are made in the area of suspicious student conduct at 75.0 percent of the colleges. In the area of student misconduct they are made at 79.0 percent of the colleges and in the area of the chronic student trouble-maker the relationship exists at 76.0 percent of the colleges. In regard to the student under psychiatric care, the exchange of information between the security officer and the office of student affairs diminishes to a 41.0 percent level. Only 7.0 percent of the institutions indicated that no exchange was made with the office of student affairs. Comparing the under 5,000 population bracket with the over 20,000 population bracket shows 26.0 percent of the former and 61.0

TABLE 20

REGULAR EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION BETWEEN CAMPUS SECURITY AND OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Areas of Information Exchange	Total Schools (N=210)	Suspicious Student Conduct	Minor Mis-Conduct	Student Trouble Maker	Student Under Psych. Care	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	74.7	79.0	76.1	41.4	7.0	9.4
Type of Control							
Private	71	67.2	68.6	72.8	35.0	11.2	4.4
Public	139	79.8	85.6	79.8	43.1	5.0	12.2
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	64.2	50.0	57.1	35.7	21.4	0.0
Four Years	76	77.2	78.6	79.9	31.4	5.2	10.4
Graduate	120	75.8	84.1	78.3	49.1	6.6	10.8
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	72.1	81.4	77.7	25.9	7.4	11.1
5,000-9,999	67	80.4	71.5	76.0	40.2	6.0	6.0
10,000-14,999	34	73.5	79.4	79.4	44.1	11.7	8.8
15,000-19,999	27	77.7	92.5	85.1	55.5	7.4	7.4
Over 20,000	28	71.4	85.7	71.4	60.7	3.5	17.8

percent of the latter as institutions in which the departments regularly exchange such information.

The relationship between the campus security office and the student body is tenuous in view of the enforcement aspect of the security officer's role. Involvement in student service programs and offering assistance to students are means available to improve communications and to aid students in their understanding of law enforcement. See Table 21.

The campus security officer participates in our sponsors service programs on a limited basis. Orientation briefings avail the security officer the most opportunity to meet the student. There is a marked difference between the 35.0 percent of the colleges in the under 5,000 bracket and the 64.0 percent of the over 20,000 population bracket which include the campus security officer in their orientation briefings. A comparison, however, of this same item, between the combined population in the 5,000 to 15,000 brackets and the population brackets over 15,000 shows only a 2.0 percent difference.

Twenty-five (25.0) percent of the private colleges and 45.0 percent of the public colleges utilize the campus security officer in lectures on narcotics and vice. Twenty (20.0) percent are in the under 5,000 population bracket and 64.0 percent are in the over 20,000 population bracket.

Campus security traffic seminars are conducted at 41.0 percent of the institutions. Civil defense meetings

TABLE 21

CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT PROGRAMS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Student Programs	Total Schools (N=210)	Orientation Briefings	Narcotics & Vice Lectures	Traffic Safety	Civil Defense	Crime Forums	Other
Total Percentage	210	50.3	37.6	41.3	23.0	17.8	6.1
Type of Control							
Private	71	42.0	25.2	35.0	16.8	11.2	5.6
Public	139	55.3	44.6	45.3	26.6	21.5	6.5
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	35.7	28.5	35.7	14.2	14.2	7.1
Four Years	76	45.8	30.1	40.6	17.0	14.4	7.8
Graduate	120	55.8	44.1	43.3	28.3	20.8	4.5
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	35.1	20.3	35.1	18.5	3.7	7.4
5,000-9,999	67	55.1	43.2	49.2	28.3	20.8	3.0
10,000-14,999	34	61.7	38.2	41.2	8.8	20.6	2.9
15,000-19,999	27	44.4	11.7	40.7	6.6	3.3	11.1
Over 20,000	28	64.2	64.2	39.3	32.1	39.3	10.7

have campus security sponsorship at 23.0 percent of the colleges, and anti-crime forums involving security personnel take place at only 18.0 percent of the colleges.

The campus security officer provides virtually no assistance to students arrested by the civilian authorities. See Table 22. Seventy-five (75.0) percent stated that security officers offer no legal aid. At only 11.0 percent of the colleges did officers offer to take arrested students in their personal custory in lieu of bail. Eight (8.0) percent attempted to obtain legal counsel and 5.0 percent appeared in court as guardian for the student. Nine of the 10 colleges providing bail, 9 of the 11 colleges appearing in court as guardians, 12 of the 18 colleges obtaining legal counsel, and 18 of the 23 colleges taking students in their custody in lieu of bail were in the under 10,000 population brackets.

Police Liaison

The relationship between campus security officers and off-campus police is one of bearing joint responsibilities and offering mutual aid. Although the composition of their clientele may vary considerably, both must necessarily accomplish similar results obtained under the same conditions prescribed by law. Despite the town-gown differences that may exist, the off-campus police are generally supportive of the campus security force. See Table 23.

TABLE 22

SECURITY OFFICE ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS IN OFF-CAMPUS ARRESTS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Assistance Offered Students	Total Schools (N=210)	No Assistance Offered	Custody in Lieu of Bail	Obtain Legal Counsel	Appear in Court as Guardians	Provide Bail	Other
Total Percentage	210	75.0	10.9	8.4	5.2	4.7	4.2
Type of Control							
Private	71	68.0	12.6	9.8	8.4	5.6	5.6
Public	139	79.8	10.0	7.9	3.6	4.3	4.3
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	85.7	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	7.1
Four Years	76	77.2	9.1	7.8	3.9	3.9	6.5
Graduate	120	74.1	4.5	9.1	6.6	5.8	3.3
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	68.4	11.1	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2
5,000-9,999	67	73.0	17.9	10.4	6.0	6.0	1.5
10,000-14,999	34	79.4	2.9	6.0	2.9	0.0	2.9
15,000-19,999	27	96.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
Over 20,000	28	78.5	10.7	14.2	3.5	3.5	7.1

TABLE 23

LOCAL POLICE AVAILABILITY TO CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Local Police Availability	Total Schools (N=210)	Emergency Manpower	Joint Investi-gation	Special Events Manpower	Regular Confer-ences	Training Campus Security	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	87.4	86.0	74.3	50.1	35.7	2.4	1.9
Type of Control								
Private	71	81.2	85.4	72.8	46.4	36.4	4.4	1.4
Public	139	92.0	87.7	75.5	53.2	35.9	1.4	2.1
Academic Level								
Two Years	14	92.8	85.7	64.2	50.0	35.7	0.0	7.1
Four Years	76	87.7	81.2	73.3	43.2	39.3	2.6	1.3
Graduate	120	87.4	90.8	77.5	55.8	34.1	2.5	1.6
Enrollment								
Under 5,000	54	38.8	81.4	63.3	40.7	29.6	5.5	1.8
5,000-9,999	67	84.9	90.9	73.0	53.6	38.7	0.0	1.5
10,000-14,999	34	85.2	76.4	79.4	52.9	32.3	0.0	0.0
15,000-19,999	27	92.5	100.0	77.7	51.8	33.3	0.0	3.7
Over 20,000	28	96.4	92.8	85.7	60.7	50.0	7.1	3.5

The local police are available for emergency manpower at 87.0 percent of the colleges and at 86.0 percent of the colleges they are available for joint investigations. They provide special events manpower at 74.0 percent of the colleges, regular conferences at 50.0 percent of the colleges and training for campus security personnel at 36.0 percent of the colleges. Only 2.0 percent indicated that the local police were not available for any support services. The opportunity for training by local police was available to 30.0 percent in the under 5,000 population bracket and to 50.0 percent in the over 20,000 bracket.

Although the local police have jurisdiction for violations of municipal and state law committed on campus, they permit some violations to be handled by the campus security office within the college's discipline structure. See Table 24. At 45.0 percent of the colleges, campus security officers are not required to institute city or state action against vandalism charges. At 42.0 percent of the colleges the offense of drunkenness is handled on campus, and 40.0 percent of the colleges are permitted to discipline the misdemeanor of petty larcency. Homosexualism is treated within the confines of the campus at 24.0 percent of the colleges and narcotics violations at 18.0 percent of the colleges. Thirty-nine (39.0) percent of the colleges reported that local police do not permit any violations of municipal and state law to be handled within the college's discipline structure.

TABLE 24

VIOLATIONS OF STATE LAW WHICH LOCAL POLICE PERMIT CAMPUS SECURITY TO HANDLE WITHIN THE COLLEGE'S DISCIPLINE STRUCTURE, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Campus Violations	Total Schools (N=210)	Vandal-ism	Drunk-enness	Petit Larceny	Homo-sexualism	Narcotics	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	45.1	42.3	40.4	24.0	17.8	39.4	7.0
Type of Control								
Private	71	53.2	53.2	50.4	28.0	23.8	28.0	5.6
Public	139	41.7	37.4	36.0	22.3	15.0	45.0	8.6
Academic Level								
Two Years	14	50.0	28.5	57.1	21.4	14.3	42.8	0.0
Four Years	76	55.0	52.4	43.2	21.0	11.7	35.4	2.6
Graduate	120	39.1	37.8	39.1	25.8	22.5	42.5	10.8
Enrollment								
Under 5,000	54	55.5	53.6	50.0	22.2	22.2	29.6	9.2
5,000-9,999	67	38.7	35.8	31.3	17.9	8.9	35.8	3.0
10,000-14,999	34	35.4	38.2	35.4	23.5	17.6	55.9	8.8
15,000-19,999	27	48.1	37.0	44.4	40.7	25.9	44.4	7.4
Over 20,000	28	53.5	50.0	50.0	28.5	25.0	46.5	10.7

Thirty (30.0) percent of these are in the under 5,000 population bracket whereas 47.0 percent of the colleges in the over 20,000 population are restricted as to the extent of disciplinary measures that may be taken on campus for violation of civil law.

The Security Officer's Function in Campus Disorder Situations

Several administrative units within the institution as well as outside police agencies take part in the effort to contain campus disorders. The extent of authority afforded each unit varies considerably depending upon the intensity of the disorder. The president is generally the key individual and the campus security office assumes a secondary role in the decision-making process in regard policy, tactical deployment, and enforcement action. See Table 25.

In the event of campus disorder, the primary policy-making authority is with the president at 71.0 percent of the institutions. The other units are closely matched in terms of their participation in policy making. Campus security and the dean for student affairs are involved at 39.0 percent of the institutions and joint command decisions are made at 36.0 percent of the institutions.

When outside police aid is present, decisions as to tactics to be employed become less a presidential matter and more of a group decision. See Table 26. At 45.0 percent of the institutions, joint command decisions are made. Forty

TABLE 25

SOURCE OF INITIAL POLICY MAKING AUTHORITY IN CAMPUS DISORDER SITUATION, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Source of Authority	Total Schools (N=210)	President	Campus Security	Dean of Students	Joint Command	Secret Plan	No Plan
Total Percentage	210	71.0	38.5	39.0	35.7	7.5	5.2
Type of Control							
Private	71	70.0	35.0	43.4	25.2	7.0	12.6
Public	139	72.6	41.0	37.4	41.7	7.9	1.4
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	71.4	21.4	14.3	42.8	7.1	0.0
Four Years	76	66.8	36.7	39.3	36.7	10.5	6.5
Graduate	120	75.0	40.8	40.8	35.0	5.8	4.5
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	74.0	33.3	42.5	25.9	5.5	9.2
5,000-9,999	67	71.6	46.2	43.2	29.8	8.9	5.9
10,000-14,999	34	67.6	47.0	37.0	35.4	8.8	2.9
15,000-19,999	27	62.9	33.3	40.7	59.2	14.8	0.0
Over 20,000	28	82.1	28.5	14.3	50.0	0.0	3.5

TABLE 26

SOURCE OF TACTICAL DECISION MAKING AUTHORITY WHEN OUTSIDE POLICE ARE PRESENT, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Source of Authority	Total Schools (N=210)	Joint Command	President	Campus Security	Outside Police	Dean of Students	Other
Total Percentage	210	44.6	40.0	35.8	34.3	23.0	2.4
Type of Control							
Private	71	37.8	54.6	35.0	39.2	40.6	2.8
Public	139	48.9	33.0	36.6	32.4	14.4	2.1
Academic Level							
Two Years	14	57.1	35.7	7.1	28.5	7.1	0.0
Four Years	76	37.9	51.0	32.7	35.4	30.1	3.9
Graduate	120	48.3	34.1	41.6	35.0	20.8	1.7
Enrollment							
Under 5,000	54	38.8	55.5	25.9	31.4	38.8	0.0
5,000-9,999	67	41.9	40.2	40.2	35.7	29.8	1.5
10,000-14,999	34	55.8	35.4	44.1	35.4	20.6	6.0
15,000-19,999	27	48.1	29.6	29.6	33.3	14.8	7.4
Over 20,000	28	50.0	28.4	42.8	39.3	3.6	0.0

(40.0) percent selected the president, 36.0 percent named the campus security office, 34.0 percent designated outside police aid, and 23.0 percent chose the dean for student affairs as decision-makers in determining tactics to be used when outside police aid is present on campus. In the under 5,000 population bracket, 56.0 percent vested tactical authority in the president, and 39.0 percent in the dean of student affairs, while in the over 20,000 bracket, 28.0 percent included the president, and only 4.0 percent considered the dean of student affairs as part of the tactical decision-making process.

These responses by the campus security director vary somewhat from the "Master Plans for Student Disorder Situations" (Appendix D), which place less tactical control in joint decision-making and greater tactical control under the direction of the outside police forces.

A variety of actions has resulted from campus disorder situations. See Table 27. Forty-five (45.0) percent of the schools have called in outside police aid. Thirty-one (31.0) percent have filed criminal charges, 22.0 percent have obtained injunctions and 4.0 percent have filed civil suits for damages. The campus security officer has enforced a curfew on 5.0 percent of the campuses, and on 15.0 percent of the campuses he has enforced a ban on the presence of non-students.

Private colleges showed a reluctance to file criminal charges with only 14.0 percent taking such action as compared to 41.0 percent for public colleges. The under 5,000

TABLE 27

ACTIONS TAKEN AGAINST STUDENTS IN CAMPUS DISORDER SITUATIONS, BY TOTAL PERCENTAGE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, BY ACADEMIC LEVEL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Actions Taken	Total Schools (N=210)	Outside Police Called	Criminal Charges Filed	Injunction	Civil Damage Suits	Student Curfew	Non-Student Ban	None	Other
Total Percentage	210	44.6	31.4	21.6	4.2	4.7	15.0	31.4	5.2
Type of Control									
Private	71	36.4	14.0	23.8	2.8	5.6	19.6	42.0	7.0
Public	139	49.6	41.0	20.9	10.4	4.3	13.0	26.6	4.3
Academic Level									
Two Years	14	42.8	21.4	7.1	14.2	7.1	14.2	42.8	14.2
Four Years	76	37.9	22.3	13.1	1.3	2.6	14.4	37.9	6.5
Graduate	120	50.0	37.5	29.1	4.5	5.8	14.2	26.6	3.3
Enrollment									
Under 5,000	54	22.2	5.5	1.8	0.0	3.7	14.8	59.2	7.4
5,000-9,999	67	41.8	20.8	22.3	0.0	1.5	19.4	28.3	4.5
10,000-14,999	34	55.8	35.4	20.6	8.8	6.0	6.0	20.6	6.0
15,000-19,999	27	62.9	62.9	29.6	7.4	7.4	14.8	25.9	3.7
Over 20,000	28	67.8	78.5	57.1	14.2	10.7	17.8	7.1	3.6

population group called in outside police at 22.0 percent of the colleges and filed criminal charges at only 6.0 percent of the colleges, while the over 20,000 population group called in outside police at 68.0 percent of the colleges and filed criminal charges at 79.0 percent of the colleges.

Thirty-one (31.0) percent of the colleges report having had no campus disorder warranting any of the above actions. Excluding these schools from this tabulation and including only those colleges experiencing serious disorder would show considerably higher percentages. For example the percentage of colleges using outside police aid would then rise from 45.0 percent to 67.0 percent.

Chapter Summary and Conclusions

The data made available from a questionnaire provided by 210 responding campus security directors show certain similar characteristics prevalent among security officers and the local police. The similarity exists in the number of officers employed per 1,000 population, in their academic backgrounds, and in the ages of the officers. It should be noted however that private colleges tend to employ older security personnel and that a greater percentage of off-campus police officers have some college background.

Part-time officers, students and females are used sparingly on campus security staffs and employment benefits

generally are limited to a paid vacation and a retirement pension. Campus security officers view their employment conditions as having fewer advantages than the local police. Their disadvantages include salary ranges, equipment, experienced personnel and employment standards. All but a small percentage voiced the need for an increase in the campus security force due to conditions arising from a larger student body, more buildings to patrol, more vehicles on campus, a rise in the individual crime rate, and the volume of student protest.

Training requirements for security officers are emphasized more at public institutions and at schools in the over 20,000 population bracket. Many of the security officers duties are of a non-police service function such as responsibility for lost and found, key control, ambulance service, and escort service for visiting dignitaries.

There are few specialists on staff, particularly at the smaller colleges. Outside police agencies are the main sources for intelligence and for the use of undercover agents. Almost all of the security staffs utilize "walkie talkie" communication devices and the student photo I.D. card has general use. Sophisticated detection instruments such as a closed circuit television set and telephone recording devices are rarely found on campus. A large number of schools have no chemical crowd control equipment available. This is

particularly evident at private institutions and in the under 5,000 population bracket and at junior colleges.

The campus security officer has minor involvement in policy-making related to student codes of conduct and to student discipline and only infrequently has regular meetings with students. He meets regularly with committees of the administration and with the office of the dean for student affairs. There is a routine exchange of information with the dean for student affairs in regard to students who may be trouble prone. The campus security office participates in student orientation briefings at one half the colleges and is involved in forums and lectures on traffic safety, narcotics and vice, crime, and civil defense at a lesser number of schools.

Students arrested by the local police receive little or no assistance from the campus security office. In none of the proposed methods to aid students in the event of an arrest were more than 11.0 percent of the institutions providing assistance. The few schools involved in such programs were schools in the population brackets under 10,000 population.

The local police make manpower, investigative skills, and training facilities available for the campus security officer at over 70.0 percent of the colleges. Only 2.0 percent indicated that the local police were not available for any support services. Violations of municipal and state laws, such as vandalism, drunkenness and petty larceny, are

permitted to be resolved within the school's discipline structure at from 40.0 to 45.0 percent of the institutions.

Campus disorder situations result in the president exercising the prerogative of his office by acting as a policy-maker at over 70.0 percent of the colleges. When outside police aid is required, decisions as to tactics to be employed are made jointly by the president, the campus security office, outside police force, and to a lesser extent the dean for student affairs. There is other evidence from The Master Plans for Student Disorder Situations to indicate that tactical control more probably passes to the off-campus enforcement agencies.

The measures taken in responding to campus disorder, beyond school disciplinary procedures, have not included the campus security office to any appreciable extent. In more than 65.0 percent of the disorder situations outside police aid has been required and to a lesser degree, the legal sanctions of criminal charges and injunctions have been filed.

An examination of the data shows a consistent pattern of private colleges and schools in the less than 5,000 population bracket as having personnel with limited qualifications and inadequate training. They possess few resources, have negligible advantages over the local police, and maintain a minimal relationship with other components of the institution. The officers in these two classifications have little involvement in campus disorder situations and are an undermanned

force, ill-equipped for seriously performing the function of a campus security officer. The public colleges and the over 20,000 population group generally reflect a more favorable posture but the significance of the difference exists only in a relative sense. All the groups, to some extent, share the deficiencies emphasized in the under 5,000 population bracket.

Although the extreme population brackets show contrary results, the conclusion cannot be drawn that an increase in population is likely to result in a more efficient operation. Eliminating the under 5,000 population bracket and then comparing the 5,000 to 14,999 brackets with the over 15,000 brackets shows but a small percentage difference. This suggests certain deficiencies in the under 5,000 population group rather than increasing efficiency being correlated to increasing population.

The self-image drawn by the security director of his operational functions and his relationships is one of a neglected, unimportant appendage of the institution. The accuracy of this estimation and the true worth of the office can perhaps best be determined through the perspective offered by the various components of the institution. Such appraisals are considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

APPRAISAL OF CAMPUS SECURITY FUNCTION

The organization and the operation of the campus security office are aimed at serving many purposes and in the process come under the scrutiny of many publics. An appraisal of its performance by faculty, students, and administrators, as well as by campus security officers, was made from a questionnaire submitted to the 245 colleges and universities in the study population.

Questionnaires were sent to the campus security chief, the chairman of the political science department, the chairman of the sociology department, the president of the student body, the editor of the student newspaper, and the dean of student affairs. It was estimated that from among the four groups, students and faculty would be least responsive: therefore questionnaires were sent to two classifications of students and to two classifications of faculty, and a response from either was deemed acceptable for the purposes of the study. In the event both responded, then the president of the student body and the chairman of the political science department were selected and the other rejected. The following number of responses are included in the study:

Campus Security	Faculty	Student	Administrator
212 (87.0%)	181 (74.0%)	165 (67.0%)	200 (82.0%)

The appraisal of the campus security function by four segments of the campus is an examination in terms of goals, techniques, and proposals for change. It provides a comparison of views of those who offer and administer the service as well as those who are its beneficiaries.

In the first eight questions the respondent is asked to check as many items as apply, and in computing responses each item is considered individually. Percentage figures therefore relate to each item rather than to the total question.

In addition to tabulating the responses from the four groups of the total population, schools with complete responses from all four groups (89) were separately tabulated. The latter was done to verify the population description obtained from the separate campus security questionnaire to which 210 responses had been received and to note any discrepancies in the percentages among each of the items. A comparison of school characteristics between the total study population and the 89 schools with all responses completed, in terms of the type of institutional control, the academic levels, and the enrollments, found an average of less than 2.0 percent difference in the representation among the two study populations.

The consistency of support for a particular item among all four respondents at each school was also examined. Sixteen (16) items were selected and the 89 schools with all four responses completed were inspected to determine the number of affirmative responses within each school.

Personnel and Administration

The goals deemed particularly appropriate for the campus security office found general concurrence among the security officer, faculty, student, and administrator in several of the items. See Table 28. Differences were most marked between the student and the security officers, and similarities were more pronounced between the administrator and the security officer.

The goal to provide protection for property and person had all four groups above 93.0 percent in support. In the internal consistency check, 82 of the 89 colleges had all four groups in support and the remaining 7 had three respondents supporting the proposition. See Table 29. The goal calling for campus security to both establish and enforce rules of conduct found 33.0 percent support among security officers but only an average of 13.0 percent support among each of the other three groups.

Organizing a traffic and parking system as a campus security objective found each of the four groups in over 83.0 percent agreement. The appropriateness of having campus

TABLE 28

GOALS DEEMED APPROPRIATE FOR THE CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE ACCORDING TO THE FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THOSE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

	Security Officer		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
Appropriate Goals	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Protect Property and Person	99.5	100.0	95.0	96.6	93.0	97.8	99.5	100.0
Establish and Enforce Rules of Conduct	32.5	28.1	13.8	11.2	12.1	13.5	13.5	16.9
Maintain Order on Campus	92.9	89.9	66.9	67.4	53.9	53.9	77.5	78.7
Interpret Function of Police	62.3	64.0	11.0	7.9	13.3	14.6	39.5	40.4
Provide System for Traffic and Parking	92.9	93.3	84.5	85.4	83.0	78.7	88.0	91.0
Aid Students in Educational Process	40.6	38.2	6.1	6.7	18.8	15.7	41.0	43.8

*The eighty-nine schools providing responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

TABLE 29

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY OF SIXTEEN SELECTED ITEMS SHOWING THE NUMBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES TO EACH ITEM WITHIN EACH OF EIGHTY NINE COLLEGES WITH ALL GROUPS RESPONDING

Affirmative Responses	0	1	2	3	4
Selected Items					
A Campus Security Goal is to Provide Protection for Property and Person	0	0	0	7	82
A Campus Security Goal is to Aid Students in the Educational Process	26	37	23	3	0
Using Less Authoritarian Enforcement Approach Would Improve Campus Security Relationships	4	12	37	28	8
Increasing the Campus Security Authority Equal to Off-Campus Enforcement Agency Would Improve His Relationships on Campus	12	38	27	12	0
A Centralized State-Wide Coordinating Body Would Improve the Operation of the Campus Security Office	20	42	19	8	0
A Joint Faculty-Senate Committee to Review Campus Security Performance Would Improve Its Operation	0	6	30	35	18
Too Few Channels of Communication Between Campus Security and Students Cause Students Misunderstanding	5	7	30	29	18
Campus Security is Policing Agency and As Such is Unacceptable to Academic Community	19	37	23	4	0

TABLE 29--Continued

Affirmative Responses	0	1	2	3	4
The Search of Dorms for Contraband Creates Stress Situations	1	6	22	31	29
Use of Necessary Force Against Student Disorders Creates Stress Situations	5	34	27	19	4
A Formal Policy Supports Demonstrations as an Appropriate Means of Expression	11	17	26	16	9
A Formal Policy Lets Students Know Bounds of Institutional Acceptance of Demonstrations	1	3	14	36	35
The Mere Presence of Outside Police Agencies May Change Orderly Demonstrations Into a Campus Disorder	10	12	27	27	13
Overreaction by Outside Police Agencies May Change Orderly Demonstrations Into a Campus Disorder	1	5	2	31	50
Students Will Respect Campus Security Officers for Properly Doing Their Job in the Event Necessary Force is Used	9	24	33	20	3
Students Will Resent Campus Security Use of Force, No Matter The Legal Manner Force was Administered	10	24	30	22	3

security maintain order on campus however found a more divided sentiment. The security officers supported this goal by 93.0 percent, the administrators 79.0 percent, the faculty members 67.0 percent and the students favored it with a low 54.0 percent support.

The goal to aid students in the educational process had a 41.0 percent support by both the security officer and the administrator, only 19.0 percent by the student and but 6.0 percent by the faculty. The internal consistency on this item showed 86 of the 89 schools as having provided from none to 2 favorable responses. See Table 29.

The security officers considered it their purpose to interpret to students the function of police agencies in our society by a 62.0 percent support. The administrators favored it with 40.0 percent support, the students showed only 13.0 percent and the faculty but 11.0 percent in favor of such a goal.

Several of the administrative procedures aimed at improving the operation of the campus security office had strong support among the groups, but none reached a consensual agreement. See Table 30.

A centralized state-wide coordinating body to establish standards for the campus security office had 59.0 percent support among security officers, 29.0 percent support among administrators, 19.0 percent among students and 14.0 percent among faculty. Its internal consistency score had

TABLE 30

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES TO IMPROVE OPERATION OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE ACCORDING TO THE FOUR GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THOSE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

Administrative Procedures	Campus Security		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Centralized State-Wide Coordination	58.5	61.8	13.8	13.5	18.8	13.5	28.5	26.2
Command Chain Direct to President	67.0	69.7	30.9	32.6	22.4	23.6	19.5	19.1
Policy Role in Student Discipline	44.3	41.6	19.3	18.0	13.3	13.5	33.0	28.1
Auto Fines Solely for Student Use	25.0	31.5	23.8	27.0	64.8	62.9	32.0	34.8
Student Ombudsman to Review Security	12.3	14.6	50.8	49.4	63.0	55.1	21.5	15.7
Joint Faculty-Student Review	37.3	40.4	80.0	79.7	80.0	80.9	71.0	76.4

*The eighty-nine schools providing responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

62 of the 89 schools with as few as 1 or none favoring it. Nineteen schools had 2 supporters and only 8 schools had as many as 3 respondents supporting a centralized coordinating body. See Table 29.

Establishing a chain of command in which the campus security officer is directly responsible to the president had a strong 67.0 percent support from the security officers, but only 20.0 to 30.0 percent among the others.

The campus security office participation in policy-making concerning student discipline was sought by 44.0 percent of the security officers, and 33.0 percent of the administrators, but by only 19.0 percent of the faculty and 13.0 percent of the students.

The use of a student ombudsman to review campus security performance had a 63.0 percent student endorsement, a 51.0 percent faculty support, a decline to 22.0 percent with administrators and finally a 12.0 percent security officer support.

A joint faculty-student committee to review campus security performance had strong support among three groups. It was accepted by 80.0 percent of both the faculty and the students, by 71.0 percent of the administrators, but only 37.0 percent of the security officers favored this administrative procedure. Its internal consistency (Table 29) showed 18 schools with all four respondents in agreement, 35 schools with 3 in faovr, 30 with 2 in favor and the

remaining 6 schools had 1 of the groups in support of the proposal.

The four responding groups examined the major duties of the campus security office and ranked in order of importance the 3 areas performed most effectively. These data are shown in Table 31.

Their choices were made from among 7 duties performed by the campus security office. Three (3) of the 4 groups were in agreement as to the rank order of the duties performed most effectively. They selected building and ground patrol first, followed by parking and then by traffic control. The fourth group, the faculty, agreed with the choices except that parking was their first choice and building and ground patrol was second. Among the seven duties, student disorders ranked fifth in performance effectiveness with security officers and administrators, sixth among faculty members, and seventh among students. Criminal investigations ranked fourth among security officers and administrators, sixth among students and seventh among faculty. The security officers and administrators had identical ranking of all items. Both faculty and students viewed student disorders and criminal investigation as the job areas performed least effectively by the campus security office. See Table 31.

Personnel changes which would most improve the performance of the campus security office were also submitted to rank order examination. See Table 32. Each of the

TABLE 31

DUTIES OF THE CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE PERFORMED MOST EFFECTIVELY BY RANK ORDER SELECTION AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS

Campus Security		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*
1. Building and Ground Patrol	476	1. Parking	393	1. Building and Ground Patrol	331	1. Building and Ground Patrol	456
2. Parking	312	2. Building and Ground Patrol	379	2. Parking	269	2. Parking	369
3. Traffic Control	229	3. Traffic Control	255	3. Traffic Control	186	3. Traffic Control	234
4. Criminal Investigation	161	4. Key Control	53	4. Ambulance Service	61	4. Criminal Investigation	74
5. Student Disorders	75	5. Ambulance Service	46	5. Key Control	35	5. Student Disorders	67
6. Ambulance Service	61	6. Student Disorders	30	6. Criminal Investigation	33	6. Ambulance Service	56
7. Key Control	35	7. Criminal Investigation	23	7. Student Disorders		7. Key Control	36

*Rank Order Score was computed by allocating three points for the respondents first choice, two points for the second choice and one point for the third choice. The totals were then ranked in order based on the highest to the lowest scores.

TABLE 32

PERSONNEL CHANGES WHICH WOULD MOST IMPROVE THE PERFORMANCE OF THE CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICE, BY RANK ORDER SELECTION AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS

Campus Security		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*
1. Increase in Salary	399	1. More Specialized Training in Human Behavior	302	1. More Specialized Training in Human Behavior	262	1. Increase in Salary	322
2. Higher Educational Requirements	273	2. Higher Educational Requirements	289	2. Higher Educational Requirements	247	2. More Specialized Training in Human Behavior	294
3. Larger Staff	258	3. Increase in Salary	210	3. Increase in Salary	203	3. Higher Educational Requirements	283
4. More Specialized Training in Human Behavior	203	4. Larger Staff	100	4. More Student Security Officers	97	4. Larger Staff	184
5. Better Equipment	109	5. More Student Security Officers	87	5. Larger Staff	83	5. Better Equipment	41
6. More Student Security Officers	10	6. More Female Security Officers	29	6. Better Equipment		6. More Student Security Officers	38
7. More Female Security Officers	4	7. Better Equipment	23	7. More Female Security Officers	27	7. More Female Security Officers	12

*Rank Order Score was computed by allocating three points for the respondents first choice, two points for the second choice and one point for the third choice. The totals were then ranked in order based on the highest to the lowest scores.

respondents among the four groups selected in order of importance their first, second and third choices. Both faculty and the students had the same top three in rank order. They chose more specialized training in human behavior first, higher educational requirements second, and increase in salary third.

The administrators supported the same items but in different order. They had salary increase first, human behavior training second, and higher educational requirements in the third order. The security officers led with salary as the major personnel need, higher educational requirements as of the next greatest importance and a larger staff was ranked third. There was little need expressed for female security officers among any of the groups, and the use of students found limited support among faculty and students, slight support by administrators and virtually none by security officers.

Campus Security Relationships with Students

The extent to which the campus security office is supportive to students can perhaps be better understood in the context of the relationships existing between the two groups. The ability to communicate, the mutual esteem offered, the kinds of enforcement action imposed upon students, and the manner in which authority is used are all indicators of this relationship.

As to the causes for students misunderstanding the role of the campus security officer the four groups expressed no wide differences, except in one item. See Table 33. Here, the statement that students do not understand the duties of the campus security officer showed 72.0 percent of the security officers and 65.0 percent of the administrators in agreement. The students showed 47.0 percent and the faculty 45.0 percent favoring the statement.

To the proposition that too few channels of communications exist between the campus security officer and the students, the results covered a small range from the students' high of 73.0 percent to the administrators' low of 59.0 percent. The internal consistency showed 47 or the 89 schools with 3 or more affirmative responses and the balance of 42 with 2 or less responses within each school. See Table 29.

The possibility that the campus security office is too low in the status hierarchy to maintain the respect of the students found agreement with 42.0 percent of the students, 40.0 percent of the security officers, 37.0 percent of the faculty and 30.0 percent of the administrators.

Agreement in slightly lower percentages and in the same order was given to the statement that the campus security is a policing agency and as such is unacceptable to the academic community. The internal consistency on this item showed no schools with all 4 respondents in support and only

TABLE 33

CAUSES ACCOUNTING FOR STUDENT MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE CAMPUS SECURITY ROLE ACCORDING TO THE FOUR GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THOSE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

Causes	Campus Security		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Students Do Not Understand Security Duties	72.2	70.8	44.8	44.9	46.7	44.9	65.0	59.6
Regulations Not Given Wide Distribution	28.0	28.1	12.7	9.0	18.8	14.6	15.0	14.6
Too Few Channels of Communication	59.0	65.2	62.4	61.8	72.7	73.0	65.5	59.6
Security Too Low in Status Hierarchy	39.2	47.2	36.5	37.1	41.8	41.6	29.5	28.1
Police Unacceptable in Academic Community	33.0	30.3	30.9	27.0	40.0	39.3	25.0	25.8

*The eighty-nine schools providing responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

4 schools with as many as three supporters. Twenty-nine (29) schools had 2 and 37 had only 1 favorable response.

Certain enforcement actions are likely to create stress situations between students and the campus security force. These data are summarized in Table 34. The extent to which a particular enforcement act deteriorates the existing relationship was uniformly recognized by each of the groups, except for an uncertainty in regard the impact of the issuing of parking tickets. Fifty-six (56) percent of the security officers took the view that the stress situation created by parking violations damaged their relationships with students, but the students supported this view by only 38.0 percent. The administrators voted at the same level as the students, and the faculty was down to 27.0 percent support.

Investigating crimes of violence had the security officer and the administrator with 8.0 percent support while the students feared its impact at 18.0 percent and the faculty at 15.0 percent rate.

Searching dormitories for contraband had consistent agreement as the greatest creator of stress situations. The faculty voiced 80.0 percent agreement, the students 77.0 percent, the administrators 75.0 percent and the security officers 69.0 percent. Sixty (60) of the 89 schools in the internal consistency test had 3 or 4 responses to the item.

TABLE 34

ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS CREATING STRESS SITUATIONS BETWEEN STUDENTS AND SECURITY OFFICERS ACCORDING TO THE FOUR GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THOSE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

	Security Officer		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
Enforcement Actions	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Issue Parking Tickets	55.7	58.4	27.1	32.6	38.2	37.1	38.0	44.9
Investigate Crimes of Violence	8.0	5.6	14.9	13.5	17.6	18.0	8.5	7.9
Search Dorms for Contraband	69.3	75.3	79.0	76.4	77.0	75.3	74.5	71.9
Necessary Force Against Disorder	49.1	47.2	43.1	42.7	46.1	48.3	49.3	46.1
Patrol Grounds	4.2	4.5	6.6	6.7	7.3	5.6	4.5	3.4
Direct Traffic	3.8	4.5	3.9	5.6	2.4	3.4	3.5	4.5
None	6.1	4.5	7.2	5.6	6.7	7.9	5.0	3.4

*The eighty-nine schools providing responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

Both the patrolling of grounds and the directing of traffic had percentage ranges from 2.4 percent to 7.3 percent and were therefore not considered as stress provokers.

The use of necessary force against student disorders was viewed as a source of discord by 49.0 percent of both the security officers and the administrators and by 46.0 percent of the students and 43.1 percent of the faculty. In the internal consistency examination as shown in Table 29, only 4 schools had all respondents in agreement and 34 schools had but 1 respondent supporting the view.

Each of the groups had an approximate 3.0 to 6.0 percent who claimed that there were no enforcement situations on their campuses which caused a deteriorating relationship between campus security and students.

The changes in the use of authority by the campus security officer that could markedly improve his relationship on campus found appreciable differences as well as similarities among the four groups. These data are examined in Table 35.

The use of a less authoritarian enforcement approach found high support among all four groups. The administrators with 66.0 percent, the faculty with 62.0 percent, and the students with 61.0 percent were joined by the security officer's 53.0 percent approval. The internal consistency score in Table 29 had only 8 schools with 4 affirmative responses and 53 schools had 2 or less of such responses.

TABLE 35

CHANGES IN USE OF AUTHORITY WHICH WILL IMPROVE CAMPUS SECURITY RELATIONSHIPS ACCORDING TO THE FOUR GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THOSE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

	Security Officer		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
Changes in Authority	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Less Authoritarian Approach	52.8	48.3	62.4	59.6	61.2	58.4	66.0	66.3
Eliminate Informers	4.7	2.2	29.3	24.7	50.9	50.6	23.0	23.0
Authority Equal to Off-Campus Police	70.3	74.2	21.0	14.6	20.0	20.2	38.5	37.1
Limit to Non-Arrest Authority	5.7	3.4	24.3	28.1	33.9	32.6	11.0	7.9
Uniforms to be Civilian-like	21.2	16.9	24.9	16.9	24.2	24.7	30.0	28.1
Weapons to be Concealed	15.1	16.9	11.0	12.4	15.8	14.6	16.5	15.7

*The eighty-nine schools providing responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

The proposal to eliminate the use of informers saw marked differences among the responding groups. Only 5.0 percent of the security officers viewed this as an area for potential improvement while 51.0 percent of the students advocated the change. Among the faculty there was 29.0 percent support and the administrators favored it by 23.0 percent.

Increasing the campus security officer's authority to equal the status of municipal or state enforcement agencies had 70.0 percent support among security officers whereas faculty and student support was at the 21.0 percent and 20.0 percent levels respectively. Among the 89 schools used for internal consistency none had a score of 4 affirmative responses and 62 had 1 or less affirmative responses.

The concept of limiting the campus security officer to non-arrest authority found strongest support with students at 34.0 percent and least support with security officers at 6.0 percent. Only 11.0 percent of the administrators and 24.0 percent of the faculty supported this approach.

Support for the replacement of standard police uniforms with civilian-like attire was constant among the four groups at a range between 21.0 percent and 30.0 percent. The requirement that security officers carry weapons concealed on their persons was supported at a lower range of 11.0 percent through 16.5 percent.

Campus Disorder Situations

The role of the campus security officer in disorder situations is conditioned in great part by the behavioral latitudes permitted students, the campus attitudes toward campus security involvement, and the extent of the involvement of the outside enforcement agencies.

The policy of the institution toward student demonstrations can be portrayed by a formal, written document that enunciates the sum total of its philosophy. See Table 36. The prospect that such a formal policy would establish behavioral standards for a desirable campus climate was agreed with by 75.0 percent of the administrators, 69.0 percent of the security officers and 52.0 percent of the faculty. Only 36.0 percent of the students supported this purpose.

The proposition that demonstrations were an appropriate means of student expression had a 54.0 percent acceptance among students, a 51.0 percent acceptance among administrators, a 45.0 percent acceptance among faculty, and a 32.0 percent acceptance among security officers. Approximately 14.0 percent less approval was expressed among each of the groups for the notion that demonstrations can also serve the purpose of providing a learning experience for students.

The statement that a formal policy is a firm declaration in support of community law found the security officer with 59.0 percent and the administrator with 45.0 percent

TABLE 36

PURPOSES SERVED BY HAVING FORMAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICY REGARDING STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS ACCORDING TO THE FOUR GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THOSE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

	Security Officer		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
Purposes of Policy	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Establish Behavioral Standards for Campus Climate	69.3	67.4	52.5	53.9	36.4	36.0	75.0	75.3
Supports Demonstrations as Means of Expression	32.1	36.0	44.8	46.1	53.9	53.9	51.0	52.8
Recognizes that Demonstrations Provide a Learning Experience	22.6	22.5	30.9	28.1	38.2	36.0	35.5	30.3
Formal Policy Supports Community Law	59.4	50.7	23.8	27.0	20.6	22.5	45.0	47.2
Students Know Bounds of Acceptance	87.3	79.8	76.8	75.3	72.7	70.8	92.5	94.4

*The eighty-nine schools providing responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

support as opposed to the faculty with 24.0 percent and the student with 31.0 percent support.

A formal policy enables students to know the bounds of institutional acceptance of demonstrations according to the agreement indicated by all four groups. Administrators registered 93.0 percent, security officers 87.0 percent, faculty 77.0 percent and students had 73.0 percent support. The internal consistency score had 35 schools with 4 complete responses and 36 schools with 3 complete responses.

The occurrences arising from the action or inaction of certain policing agencies may well change an orderly student demonstration into a campus disorder. See Table 37. The mere presence of outside police agencies as a cause for disorder was supported by 67.0 percent of the students, 59.0 percent of the security officers, and by 55.0 percent of both the administrators and the faculty. The internal consistency score had 13 of the 89 schools with 4 affirmative responses and 27 with 3 affirmative responses.

The failure of the campus security office to take prompt, early, deterrent actions was cited by 57.0 percent of the security officers as a cause of disorders. The others ranged from the students' 17.0 percent to the administrators' 34.0 percent.

Except for some student support, there was little approval for the view that the campus security office's efforts to control demonstrations brought on campus disorders.

TABLE 37

OCCURRENCES THAT MAY CHANGE AN ORDERLY STUDENT DEMONSTRATION INTO A CAMPUS DISORDER ACCORDING TO THE FOUR GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

Occurrences	Security Officer		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Mere Presence of Outside Police Agencies	58.5	58.4	54.7	52.8	66.7	61.8	55.0	58.4
Campus Security Failure to Take Prompt Early Action	56.6	52.8	27.6	22.5	17.0	15.7	33.5	24.7
Campus Security Effort to Control the Demonstration	15.1	15.7	19.9	23.6	32.7	25.8	21.5	21.3
Overreaction by Outside Police	72.6	79.8	84.5	84.3	92.1	91.0	88.0	91.0
Delay in Calling Outside Police	34.0	39.3	18.2	21.3	9.1	7.9	31.0	30.3

*The eighty-nine schools providing responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

The students' criticism was expressed by a 33.0 percentage but the other reactions were progressively lower. The administrators registered 22.0 percent, the faculty 20.0 percent and the security officers 15.0 percent.

Strong support by all groups was given to the statement that overreaction by outside police agencies to potential threat caused campus disorders. Ninety-two (92.0) percent of the students, 88.0 percent of the administrators, 85.0 percent of the faculty and 73.0 percent of the security officers concurred with the statement. The internal consistency results showed 50 of the 89 schools with 4 affirmative responses, and 32 with 3 affirmative responses leaving a balance of only 8 schools with 2 or less affirmative responses. See Table 29.

The suggestion that delay in calling in outside police agencies may change an orderly student demonstration into a campus disorder had no large sources of support. Thirty-four (34.0) percent of the security officers and 31.0 percent of the administrators approved, whereas but 18.0 percent of the faculty and only 9.0 percent of the students were in agreement with the proposal.

Certain attitudes may arise on campus in the event the security office uses force to respond to disorder situations. See Table 38. In a hypothetical situation that the force exerted was necessary and was used properly, the results showed a mixed-to-favorable attitude toward the security force.

TABLE 38

ATTITUDE THAT WILL PREVAIL IN THE EVENT CAMPUS SECURITY USES NECESSARY FORCE TO RESPOND TO CAMPUS DISORDER ACCORDING TO THE FOUR GROUPS, BY PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND BY PERCENTAGE OF THE COLLEGES WITH ALL FOUR GROUPS RESPONDING

Attitudes	Security Officer		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
	Total Population (N=212)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=181)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=165)	All Four Groups* (N=89)	Total Population (N=200)	All Four Groups* (N=89)
Students will Respect Campus Security	59.0	60.7	38.7	32.6	37.6	38.2	57.5	53.9
Students will Resent Force	36.3	36.0	48.6	49.4	52.1	52.8	40.0	46.1
Faculty will Reject Force	34.9	34.8	22.7	20.2	28.5	30.3	27.5	27.0
Faculty will Support Action	48.1	46.1	52.5	48.3	47.3	44.9	64.5	59.6
Administration will Favor Action	69.8	73.0	63.0	65.2	73.3	71.9	72.5	70.8
Student Personnel Office will Disassociate From Action	15.6	14.6	9.4	13.5	19.4	15.7	11.5	11.2

*The eighty-nine schools with completed responses from all of the four groups were tabulated separately to verify the total population data.

The proposition that students will respect campus security officers for properly doing their job, in the hypothetical situation, was approved by security officers and administrators with 59.0 percent and 58.0 percent respectively. There was less support among the faculty and students, with the faculty at 38.0 percent and the students with the group low of 37.0 percent.

The statement that students will resent the campus security use of force, no matter the legal manner force was administered, had 52.0 percent student support and 49.0 percent faculty support. The administrators showed 40.0 percent favorable and the security officers agreed at a 36.0 percentage rate.

The suggestion that the faculty will reject the use of force generally, and particularly by an agency of the academic institution, had least support among the faculty. Thirty-five (35.0) percent of the security officers accepted the suggestion but only 29.0 percent of the students, 28.0 percent of the administrators and but 23.0 percent of the faculty was in agreement.

The belief that the faculty would support the campus security office in that the action was necessary to protect life and property was accepted by 65.0 percent of the administrators, 53.0 percent of the faculty, 48.0 percent of the security officers and 47.0 percent of the students.

The view that the administration would favor the campus security action because it avoided the need for outside police agencies had firm concurrence among all four groups. The students and the administrators both showed 73.0 percent agreement, the security officers 70.0 percent and the faculty 65.0 percent agreement.

The likelihood that student personnel officers would disassociate themselves from the actions of the campus security office found virtually no acceptance. Students expressed only 19.0 percent support, security officers only 16.0 percent support, administrators only 12.0 percent support, and the faculty with only 9.0 percent support was least critical of the student personnel officers.

The determination of which enforcement agencies are most qualified to respond to campus disorders in the event force is deemed necessary was examined in Table 39. Each of the four groups selected in rank order the three agencies of their choice. All four groups agreed that the campus security office was most qualified, followed by the municipal forces. Three of the four groups chose state forces as their third selection but the students preferred the category of "None." Federal forces ranked fourth with three of the groups and sixth with the students but in the rank score tabulations the federal forces scored appreciably lower than the top three selections among all four groups.

TABLE 39

ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES MOST QUALIFIED TO RESPOND TO CAMPUS DISORDERS BY RANK ORDER SELECTION AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS

Campus Security		Faculty		Students		Administrators	
Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*	Rank Order	Score*
1. Campus Security Office	408	1. Campus Security Office	323	1. Campus Security Office	258	1. Campus Security Office	396
2. Municipal Police	377	2. Municipal Police	262	2. Municipal Police	220	2. Municipal Police	310
3. State Forces	320	3. State Forces	208	3. None	138	3. State Forces	265
4. Federal Forces	79	4. Federal Forces	88	4. State Forces	128	4. Federal Forces	85
5. Other	37	5. Special Volunteer Auxiliary Force	61	5. Special Volunteer Auxiliary Force	117	5. Special Volunteer Auxiliary Force	69
6. Special Volunteer Auxiliary Force	35	6. None	58	6. Federal Forces	54	6. None	25
7. None	5	7. Other	7	7. Other	10	7. Other	11

*Rank Order Score was computed by allocating three points for the respondents first choice, two points for the second choice and one point for the third choice. The totals were then ranked in order based on the highest to the lowest scores.

Chapter Summary and Conclusions

The appraisal of the campus security office by security officers, administrators, students and faculty saw security officers and administrators more often sharing a view that differed from the position concurred in by faculty and students.

In approving the goals appropriate for his office, the security officer expressed over 90.0 percent support in those areas relating to the enforcement duties of the position, but in the items suggesting more of a supportive than a policing role, such as aiding students in the educational process, there was a considerably lessened degree of interest expressed by security officers and only token support offered by the other three groups.

Administrative changes capable of providing greater status for their office were acceptable to security officers, but were summarily rejected by the other groups. These included proposals for a centralized, state-wide coordinating body, a chain of command leading directly to the president, and policy participation concerning student discipline. Procedures creating a student ombudsman and a joint faculty-student review committee to scrutinize conduct of campus security officers found consistent support only among the faculty and students.

There was almost complete unanimity of opinion in ranking the effectiveness of campus security performance. Building and ground patrol ranked first, followed by parking and then by traffic control. Among the faculty there was a slight change only in the order of ranking. It also appeared that the area performed least effectively was student disorders, ranking no better than fifth of the seven items among any of the groups.

Personnel changes which would most improve the performance of the campus security office had the security officers and the administrators ranking salary increase first, while the faculty and the students chose more specialized training in human behavior as their top choice. There was virtually no call expressed for either more students or more females as security officers. This resistance was particularly evident among security officers.

The belief by the security officer and the administrator that the students' misunderstanding of the campus security role was caused by their failure to comprehend the duties of the security office was concurred in, to some extent, by both the faculty and the students. An equally strong position, held by all groups, was the corollary view that too few channels of communication exist between the campus security office and the students. The rejection

of the security officer in the academic setting as a repressive symbol the very nature of his duties was examined in two items and about 35.0 percent of all groups considered his mere presence unacceptable.

The enforcement action creating the greatest stress arose from the search of residence halls for contraband, according to the more than 70.0 percent of each group's responses whereas directing traffic, patroling grounds, and investigating crimes of violence created little stress. Less than 50.0 percent of all groups considered the use of necessary force a threat to the continued peaceful student-security officer relationship. Except for the issuance of parking tickets, which the security officers appeared to overstate as a serious stress situation, the four groups are uniformly agreed as to the main areas of likely discord.

In regard changes in the use of the campus security officer's authority, a majority of each groups recognized that a less authoritarian approach will improve relationships. Security officers are not, however, amenable to the student insistence that informers be eliminated, as shown by the less than 5.0 percent who concur.

The security officer seeks authority equal to that of off-campus police, a position students and faculty summarily reject. One-third of the students preferred

to limit the security officer to non-arrest authority, to which the security officer and administrator offer only token support. There is only small support among any of the groups for civilian-like attire to replace police uniforms and for weapons to be concealed rather than openly displayed.

All four groups firmly uphold the view that a formal college policy regarding student demonstrations enables students to know the bounds of institutional acceptance, but considerably less support is shown for school policy that sustains demonstrations as a means of expression or as providing a learning experience.

All of the groups concluded that over-reaction by outside police agencies to potential threat will change an orderly demonstration into a campus disorder and that to a somewhat lesser degree, the mere presence of outside police agencies will bring on a campus disorder.

There was a mixed attitude toward the campus security officers' use of necessary force. The four groups, each averaging about 70.0 percent, were in agreement that the school administration will support the action of the security office. More than twice the number of faculty chose to support rather than reject the use of force when necessary, while over 50.0 percent of the students resented the use of any force.

The campus security office was ranked by all groups as the agency most qualified to respond with force to campus disorders. When considered alongside the earlier finding that this was one of the duties they performed least effectively, it suggests that other alternatives or major modifications may be required in campus disorder situations. The rankings appear to be made in order of proximity. Campus security forces first, followed by municipal and state agencies, with the federal agencies, as being least desirable.

To determine the uniformity of responses within an institution, a tabulation of affirmative responses to 16 selected items was made among the 89 schools, which had all four groups responding. See Table 29. The results reflected attitudes paralleling the differences among the four groups generally, rather than displaying a different set within a particular institution.

The appraisal by the four groups confirmed the shortcomings earlier indicated in the examination of the campus security operational functions. The appraisers expressed no desire to enlarge the authority or to enhance the position of campus security, which they deemed as being unable to provide supportive services or to relate to students. Only in comparison with the lowly esteemed outside police agencies did campus security units gain a relative acceptance. Neither the ineffectual presence of campus security

forces nor the authoritarian conduct of off-campus police has produced a favorable response to the precise needs of institutions of higher education. The ill-fitting present structure calls for the development of new approaches, amenable to security management in a college environment.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

This study was designed to describe the structure of the campus security office and to appraise its function through an examination of its legal apparatus and by the relationships it has maintained with other components of institutional life.

Six questions were earlier propounded in terms of the purpose of the study and, by utilizing several research methods, adequate response was obtained. The questions as to the legal status of the security office were determined by a review of the statutory law, case law, and attorney general opinions bearing on the authority of the security officer. The questions as to the structure, the functioning and the relationships of the security office were examined through a questionnaire submitted to the membership of the International Association of College and University Security Directors (IACUSD). Variables such as types of institutional control, academic levels, and enrollments were considered. The questions as to the assessment of the campus security function and its ability to be supportive to students were

surveyed by an instrument submitted to campus security officers, faculty, students, and administrators at each of the 245 institutions of higher education participating in the study.

The study took cognizance of the inconsequential role heretofore delegated to the security officer and the significant part he may yet play as the threat to the security of the campus accelerates.

The history of the campus security office reflects a variety of service tasks distributed among several functionaries which ultimately came to be housed together. From the early fire-watching days to traffic control and student disorder, it has been a body generally utilized "for" but rarely considered "of" the university. Campus security officers and their predecessors have been long cast in roles of menial activities with minimal responsibilities. Never having attained recognition and legitimacy as a part of the total university community, they continue to exercise an uncertain authority amidst a questioning constituency.

The uncertainty that has always surrounded the role of the campus security officer is best evidenced in the limitations placed upon his authority. Until recent years few of the state legislatures bestowed direct arrest authority upon a campus security officer. The authority was obtained derivately as a result of deputization by the local municipal police department or by the sheriff. Although many

state legislatures now permit the governing bodies of higher education, such as the boards of regents, to designate campus security officers with peace officers' authority, deputization continues.

This situation exists inasmuch as the authority obtained through the governing bodies is usually of a narrow range and it has not yet had the benefit of adequate court testing and judicial approval. Some few states permit private colleges to obtain similar appointments, generally through application to the governor, but the rule among private colleges has been to rely on deputization for their campus security authority.

Among the states requiring mandatory training for entering police officers, several do not yet consider a campus security officer subject to the standards imposed upon peace officers. Moreover, the federal government sepcifically excludes many campus security officers from the benefits of available training scholarships. Virtually no organized, state-wide specialized training programs for campus security officers are either required under the law or are afforded under state auspices.

The law is well established in regard the right of institutions of higher educations to control traffic and parking within their own disciplinary machinery. The courts have upheld the colleges' imposition of reasonable penalties for

such violations and have provided the civil court system as an appeal tribunal.

Adequate legal precedent exists upon which a campus security officer may enter a residence hall in search of contraband without benefit of a search warrant. The case law condoning such entry is predicated upon several theories. The major legal premise is that the institution must be afforded the flexibility of access to all buildings in order to properly govern itself. The student is also considered only a temporary occupant of the premises and by his enrollment "waives" certain rights. The privilege of entry is available to administrators and may be delegated to law enforcement officers in the pursuit of a reasonable investigation. The erosion of the "in loco parentis" doctrine and the most recent judicial pronouncement in Moore v. Troy State[1] suggest that the privilege of entry without a warrant may not be arbitrarily invoked.

The formalized role of the campus security office in major stress situations such as organized or spontaneous campus disorder is to provide intelligence upon which administrators may make decisions, to serve as liaison with outside police agencies, and to gather evidence for later use against students violating the law. Although the press

---

[1]Moore v. Student Affairs Committee of Troy State University 284 F. Supp. 725 (1968).

of events may force campus security officers into confrontation situations, the plans for responding to campus disorders do not generally contemplate such a role. The campus security office's early involvement is aimed primarily at delay so that student personnel officers and the executive officer may have the opportunity to use whatever personal, persuasive influence they can marshal. In the event the institutional executive determines that outside force is necessary, the campus security serves as a communications liaison to interpret the tactical decisions demanded by the outside police agencies in terms of the goals aspired to by the executive.

While the complexities of a campus-wide disorder may impose limitations upon the involvement of the security officer, his ability to respond to the normal, foreseeable, routine, enforcement contingencies also remains open to question. The profile of the campus security function discloses many characteristics that suggest only a minimal ability to satisfy ordinary campus needs.

Particularly among small institutions and especially private colleges, the training is limited, the equipment is meager, and the advantages over the local police non-existent. The security force generally lacks specialists within the department, has a minimum of sophisticated equipment, and what little intelligence is available is obtained from outside

police sources. Students and female officers are scarcely used and only in short demand.

All components of the university recognize that the campus security force most effectively performs the tasks requiring the least specialty training. Building and ground patrol, parking, and traffic control are at the top rank, in that order, while the duties involving criminal investigation and student disorders are the areas least effectively performed.

It is apparent to security officers that the presence of larger student bodies, more vehicles on campus, more buildings to patrol, a rise in the individual crime rate, and the potential for disorder arising from student demonstrations call for an increased professional staff.

Administrative changes are sought by security officers with almost 60.0 percent favoring a centralized, statewide coordinating body and almost 70.0 percent requesting a chain of command which would lead directly to the president. None of the other respondent groups (faculty, students, administrators) evinces strong support for these propositions.

There is no consensus among the campus groups as to the personnel changes which would most improve performance. The security officers and the administrators ranked salary increase as the top priority personnel change, whereas the students and the faculty selected specialized training in human behavior as their first choice. Inasmuch as the campus

security office services a select clientelle in a unique setting, the projected changes need not be weighed against the prototype sought for the law enforcement officer employed to exercise order among the general population.

The campus security office has virtually no involvement in policy-making beyond traffic regulations and has little contact in a formal setting with students and faculty. A good working relationship seems to exist with the office of student affairs and other administrators as well as with the outside police agencies.

The strong support indicated by all four groups (campus security, faculty, students and administrators) for the proposition that too few channels of communication exist between the campus security office and the students is evidenced by the lack of security officer participation in student educational programs, by the failure of the campus security office to meet regularly with student committees, and by the security office's absence in the process of establishing student codes of conduct and student discipline procedures. Students involved in off-campus arrests cannot look for security office assistance except to a small extent at schools in the under 10,000 population brackets.

Although administrative support for the campus security office as a policy-making body is absent, there is evidence showing regular committee meetings with the office of student affairs and other administration groups. A

continuing exchange of information exists with the office of student affairs concerning problem students, and a concurring belief is held by all four groups that the administrators and the office of student affairs would support the action of the campus security office in a disorder situation.

The agreeable working relationship with administrators also extends to outside police agencies. The local police are available for many manpower and investigative services, and in some instances campus violations of the municipal and state law may be handled by security officers within the framework of the school's discipline structure rather than requiring students to face criminal prosecution. Despite the amicable ties between the campus security force and the local police, the security officer joined with the other three groups in unequivocally asserting that the overreaction by outside police agencies was the occurrence most likely to change an orderly student demonstration into a campus disorder.

The aspirations of the campus security officer to contribute to the educational goals of the institution and to partake of its traditional customs finds little of a responsive chord among other components on campus. Although 40.0 percent of the security officers considered the aiding of students in the educational process as an appropriate goal, only 18.0 percent of the students and 6.0 percent of the faculty voiced agreement. The campus security officer

viewed himself as the interpreter of the function of police agencies in our society, but the concept had only scattered support with the students and the faculty.

There was mixed sentiment toward the campus security officer's enforcement role. Some of the characteristics deemed the antithesis of higher education tradition were attributed to him. For instance, all of the groups identified him with an authoritarian enforcement approach. In addition 50.0 percent of the students were critical of his use of informers and about 25.0 percent of all groups suggested that uniforms be replaced with civilian-like attire. Despite the 70.0 percent of the security officers seeking increased authority, there was a reluctance to increase campus security authority or to allow participation in student discipline policy-making. The suggestion that the campus security office is a policing agency and as such is unacceptable to the academic community averaged but a 30.0 percent acceptance among all four groups. While the campus security office was not totally repudiated because of its law enforcement posture, nonetheless it has not been afforded peer status by the other components of the campus society.

The anticipation that a supportive relationship can be maintained with students while performing enforcement duties is an unfulfilled expectation. This was apparent to all four groups in their over 70.0 percent recognition that duties such as searching residence halls for contraband are

inimical to maintaining a compatible association, and as well in their almost 50.0 percent recognition of the stress created in using necessary force against student disorders. Duties involving building and grounds patrol, traffic control, and criminal investigation are performed in less strained settings permitting a more harmonious relationship.

The image of the campus security officer that is transmitted to the student represents order and authority. The uniform, the weapons, and the equipment are synonymous with discipline and control. From the student point of view, the product is not conducive to a mutuality of interest. The absence of joint educational programs and regularly scheduled committee meetings also negates the development of any meaningful interchange. The failure of campus security to offer assistance to students in need of aid as a result of an off-campus arrest may further estrange the two groups. The differential in educational background and age also widens the chasm.

Students do not go so far as to state that the campus security officer is too low in the status hierarchy to maintain their respect but they strongly favor supervisory controls such as student ombudsman and a joint faculty-student committee to review the performance of the campus security officer.

The campus security officer as presently constituted is not trained to provide supportive services for students,

is not given a status role by the administration which would engender a high regard, and does not participate in policy making or become involved in aspects of the educational process.

Little recognition is attainable to the security officer other than that arising from his enforcement activities. There are few if any common grounds existing between him and the student from which a symbiotic relationship may develop.

In some few critical areas the results reflected similar percentage support among the four groups. However, the internal consistency check to determine agreement among the four groups within each institution showed that in only 2 of the 16 selected items were there affirmative responses suggesting consistent agreement within each of the schools. The item of greatest support had 82 of the 89 schools with all four groups agreeing to the truism that the campus security goal is to provide protection for property and person. Fifty schools had all components in agreement that the overreaction by outside police agencies may change orderly demonstrations into a campus disorder. The other items showed considerably lower internal consistency scores. The diversity of attitude among the component groups that comprise the educational institutions of higher learning and the lack of unanimity within each institution suggest a searching reexamination of the campus security model.

Conclusions

The legal understructure of the campus security office requires a thorough overhauling. The qualifications for employment, the extent of arrest authority, and the control over student conduct are three areas that should be clearly enunciated under the law. Comprehensive statutory enactments and further judicial declarations can stabilize the performance in these areas.

The inadequacies of employment standards for recruits and the lack of required training particularly among the private colleges and those in the under 5,000 population bracket point to the need for standardized control. Thirty-three states have agencies, created by statute, which control minimum entrance standards and require training for peace officers. One-third of these states do not acknowledge the campus security officer as a full-fledged police officer and therefore not subject to the statutory standards.

The areas of arrest authority and the qualifications for employment have a direct statutory relationship. Only those officers with full arrest authority are subject to the state standards established for police officers. In the past two years, the number of states authorizing arrest power equal to that of peace officers has sharply increased. Many of these statutes, however, contain limitations upon both appointment and jurisidction. The statutes apply primarily to

public institutions with only seven states providing direct avenues for private institutions to obtain arrest authority.

The legal revamping of the campus security office so that a model responsive to today's needs may emerge requires full, general arrest authority equal to that of the peace officer. This authority is necessary at private as well as public institutions. Seventy (70.0) percent of the security officers support such an increase. Private institutions should, by statute, be afforded the opportunity to apply to the Governor for commissions that will permit full police authority as is provided for under North Carolina law and has been upheld in an Attorney General Opinion, dated February 2, 1970. Statutory provisions vesting full police authority in the campus security office will eliminate the second class image deriving from limited authority and deputization. It will further authorize the states to include campus security officers among those for whom minimum eligibility and training standards are required.

Judicial decisions governing student-school relationships are in a state of change. The entry into a student residence hall in search of contraband and the use of telephonic recording devices are stress-creating acts in that they are often performed without affording the student the constitutional protections provided other citizens. The courts are in the process of redefining these acts in terms

of the decline of the "in loco parentis" doctrine. Early legal redefinitions in this area are much needed.

Approximately 75.0 percent of the respondents among the four component groups in this study supported the proposition that the search of residence halls for co traband was the enforcement action that created the greatest stress situation. In view of the grave consequences growing from such action and the possibility that legal entry may in the not-too-distant future require a search warrant, it is perhaps appropriate for campus security presently to establish standards commensurate with those provided the general population.

While an adequate legal posture may create a firm base from which to function, the campus security office must develop the use of certain techniques which attest to its ability at specialization. Specialized and advanced training are major goals which have received only token recognition. Both faculty and students selected specialized training in human behavior as their first choice among personnel changes which would most improve the performance of the campus security officer. Yet only 34.0 percent of the colleges provided this training. Crowd control training was available for 38.0 percent of the colleges with but 14.0 percent of the private colleges presenting such training. Only two states, New York and Texas, both with centralized state-wide coordination, offered specialized training for campus security

personnel on a regular basis. Six other states have had periodic offerings of advanced campus security training, usually on a short-term basis.

Providing advanced training opportunities as well as the establishing of standards can best be accomplished by the utilization of a centralized state-wide coordinating unit. Almost 60.0 percent of the security officers supported such an administrative procedure to improve the operation of the campus security office. The California State College system, and the Florida Board of Regents also have state security coordinators whose duties include the coordination of system-wide campus security programs, and the developing and furthering of legislative proposals relating to campus security operations. The state-wide security coordinators can service individual institutions in a host of ways without impairing the institutions' ability to take independent action. The coordinator may assist in the development of institutes, provide budgetary advice, compile data, and serve as a link among the institutions and to the governing boards. He is in a position to be the spokesman for campus security officers in representations to the legislature and other units of government concerned with campus security operation.

The administrative restructuring flowing from legal alterations and from a centralized, state-wide approach will bring about significant change only as the campus security officer becomes an integral part of the educational institution.

Although the campus security officer and the local police officer have similar responsibilities and may require similar kinds of authority, their constituencies sharply differ. The campus security officer functions in an artificial and highly structured environment. His clientelle bears little resemblance to the cross-section of society to whom the local police officer is responsible. The reluctance of the academic community to acknowledge force as a means of control has limited the enlargement of the security force responsibility. The result has been an undermanned, underequipped, and ill-conceived replica of the local police.

There has been a failure to create a campus security officer from within the image of the institution. The characteristics he reflects are alien in a campus setting. He is relatively uneducated among those who place the highest value on education. He is in full adulthood where the premium is on youth; his earning capacity is low among those with high potential, and he is symbolic of repression amidst advocates of freedom.

A totally restructured campus security office must have roots in the university with the resources of the institution drawn upon for staffing and training. An interdisciplinary effort among departments such as education, political science, police science and government has the capacity to produce a new kind of campus service officer. A curriculum devised for a joint Masters Degree program

involving student personnel services and police science can develop insights and skills directly related to this position. Utilizing the campus security office as an intern site for student personnel candidates offers a valuable learning source. Educating student personnel officers to understand the vagaries of the criminal justice system, to be aware of problems surrounding crimes likely to involve students, to develop investigative techniques, and to evaluate mass disorders from a law enforcement point of view are necessary attributes. This kind of trained student utilized as an intern, a part-time employee or as a career person can be an important asset in ameliorating the differences between the student and the campus security officer.

The use of interdisciplinary programs to actively involve students with the campus security office must be accompanied by an equal opportunity for the campus security office to reach the students. The limited participation in and sponsorship of academic and informational programs can be partially rectified by providing an appropriate academic or administrative rank to the campus security director. This entails employing individuals with qualifications warranting such rank. It would encourage increased involvement in academic affairs and merit a more receptive response thereto by the students.

Enlisting trained students and offering academic rank can be meaningful steps if accompanied by a reorganized

administrative base. The security officer, as such, must have new dimensions. His functional performance must view each task assigned as a part of the total campus relationship.

There is a variety of functions involving the campus security force. Each has a lesser or greater involvement with the student and the institutions, and the qualifications for performance may vary considerably. Many of the duties are of a perfunctory, low level, clerical nature involving lost and found, key control, and other miscellaneous assignments. These are historical remnants better located in other departments or assigned to clerical personnel. The parking of vehicles is a major area of concern which can be adequately filled by metermaids, preferably students.

Recommendations: A Proposed Model

The major components of the security force should encompass three main units: patrol, investigation, and student services.

The patrol unit is concerned with protecting the campus from outside intruders, insuring the safety of students, and generally being alert to fire or other damage threats. Employment would require minimum qualifications similar to that of the city police officer with specialized training provided within the institution. Authority symbols are to be used sparingly. Standard police uniforms will be replaced by non-military garb, and weapons, if considered

necessary, would be concealed rather than on holster display. Part-time student employees, preferably law students and police science majors, would supplement the regular personnel and where practicable, each team of two officers would include a student officer.

The investigation unit is primarily engaged in obtaining information relative to a crime committed or one that may be in the making. Its personnel must be versed in the art of detection, interrogation, surveillance, and other enforcement techniques. In many instances supportive services from the local police department may be required and the campus security investigator must have the ability to coordinate such an effort. Of major concern here is the certainty that the student is properly being afforded his constitutional rights. A university legal officer, familiar with the criminal law, should be available for consultation. The investigator should have a baccalaureate degree with in-service training requiring regular enrollment at the institution for appropriate courses both in his field and in related matters.

The student services unit will provide a combined student personnel officer and enforcement officer. He will concern himself directly with student problems as they relate to the law. His role will be preventive and educational. The campus service officer will be a pure offspring of the university. He will have completed the interdisciplinary Masters Degree Program and will be a career officer. The unit

will consist of others of like background plus student interns in student personnel and police science. The introduction of this concept can further overcome the present lack of communications with student committees and the failure to participate in student oriented programs.

Budgetary schedules for each of these units will be competitive with other comparable occupations. Promotion would be confined to levels within each unit with transfer permissible only upon compliance with entrance requirements.

The "new" three-unit security model contains a nucleus capable of providing professional leadership in a major campus crisis involving the use of force. As presently constituted, the campus security office is not equipped to respond to serious disorder and in most cases reliance has not been placed on the office for such responsive action. Among schools where it was necessary to take extraordinary action in a campus disorder situation, 67.0 percent chose to call in outside police aid. There was close to a 60.0 percent agreement among all four responding groups that the mere presence of outside police agencies was an occurrence that may well change an orderly student demonstration into a campus disorder. A substantially higher percentage among all four groups concluded that the overreaction by outside police agencies to the potential threat was the catalyst leading to campus disorder.

Although the campus security officer's questionnaire responses suggest a shared authority in tactical decision-making among the president, campus security, and outside police forces, an examination of the operational "Master Plans for Campus Disorder" shows a decided control being exercised by outside police agencies once they are present on campus.

Tactical decisions should obviously be made by the agency familiar with the terrain, sensitive to the problem, and with a developed relationship toward the violators. Providing command authority to forces unfamiliar with the campus and lacking natural ties to the constituency can lead only to an acceleration of hostilities. The acceptance of the campus security office by all four groups as the agency most qualified to respond to campus disorder and the total rejection of outside forces lead to the conclusion that the authority of campus security be predominant.

The tactical forces serving under the direct command of the campus security officer can be specially recruited from among neighboring police units, students, and faculty. Familiarity with the campus and the students will be an essential aim of their regular training. In the event further outside police aid is necessary, then the additional forces will continue to deploy under the campus security director. Under the scheme proposed here, he is the one individual who both understands the campus setting and possesses an

enforcement background. He normally enjoys a compatible relationship with off-campus police and by virtue of his employment will adequately represent the goals of the educational institution.

Implementation of the model will require the passage of legislation granting increased authority to the campus security officer. It will demand a budget far in excess of present proportions. Personnel need be of a rank and quality superior to those presently employed.

The federal government can assist through provisions of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act by providing facilities for specialized training programs. It can further be the source for enabling the International Association of College and University Security Directors (IACUSD) to offer significant service capabilities. Federal funds to maintain an IACUSD staff with library and research resources will provide a flow of information among colleges and universities for the furtherance of development projects as well as making a national intelligence net available for enforcement purposes. The inter-disciplinary and intern aspects of the model security officer program may also merit federal financial support.

Over the years the university has had both the need and the opportunity to develop a system of control that would maintain order while avoiding repression. An elite corps of campus security specialists, trained within the university setting could well have been the model for the "new" dimensions

aspired to by the general community police officer. Had the university used the campus security situation as a research laboratory, a new breed of enforcement officer might have been developed, more responsive to crime in the streets as well as to disorder on the campus.

The campus security officer has travelled a considerable distance since the early watchman days, but he need not look too far behind to see that role still beckoning. The crisis on campus has created a void which, with adequate upgrading and new orientation, he may well fill. A revitalization and resurgency can make it not only truly protective of property and person but also supportive of students and contributory to the educational process.

Appendix A. STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE AND APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

TALLAHASSEE 32306

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A Survey of the Campus Security Office

USE OF INFORMATION

It is hoped that the results of this Survey will aid in the further professionalization of the Campus Security Officer.

The information received will be used to describe the campus security office in terms of its group functions.

The responses of individuals and the identification of characteristics of specific institutions will not be released or published.

	PLEASE DO NOT FILL IN
1. Name of Institution _____	___(1-3)
2. Title of person completing questionnaire _____	__(4,5)

3. Type of Institution (Please describe your school by checking one choice in each of the following Groups)

Group A	Group B	Group C	
___ Private	___ Two Year	___ Coed	___(6)
___ Public	___ Four Year	___ All Male	___(7)
	___ Graduate	___ All Female	___(8)

Please fill in all the following spaces with the information requested.

4. _____	Total student population	_____(9-13)
5. _____	Department Head to whom you are responsible	__(14)
6. _____	Number of full-time officers	__ __(15,16)
7. _____	Number of part-time officers	__ __(17,18)
8. _____	Number of students employed as officers	__ __(19,20)
9. _____	Number of females employed as officers	__ __(21,22)
10. _____	Average school years officers completed	__ __(23,24)
11. _____	Average age of officers	__ __(25,26)
		Blank (27)

Do Not Fill In

11. Your officers have the following employment benefits (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Civil Service (28)
____ Retirement pension (29)
____ High hazard insurance (30)
____ Paid vacation (31)

12. Training is required in the following areas (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Recruit (32)
____ In-Service (33)
____ Riot control (34)
____ Student behavior (35)
____ None (36)
____ Other (Specify): (37)

13. Major non-police duties include the following (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Ambulance service (38)
____ Key control (39)
____ Fire service (40)
____ Lost and found (41)
____ Other (Specify): (42)

14. Use of authority symbols (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Wear uniforms (43)
____ Carry night sticks (44)
____ Drive marked vehicles (45)
____ None (46)
____ Other (Specify): (47)

15. The following are specialists in your department (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Narcotics expert (48)
____ Undercover agent (49)
____ Vice officer (50)
____ None (51)
____ Other (Specify): (52)

Blank (53)

Do Not Fill In

16. Source of undercover agents (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Regular staff (54)
____ Student body (55)
____ Off-Campus police (56)
____ None (57)
____ Other (Specify): (58)

17. Sources of Intelligence (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Other schools (59)
____ Outside police agencies (60)
____ Informants (61)
____ None (62)
____ Other (Specify): (63)

18. Security equipment in use (Check all spaces that apply)

____ T.V. closed circuit (64)
____ Walkie talkies (65)
____ Telephone recording device (66)
____ Automatic burglar alarm (67)
____ Student photo I.D. card (68)

19. Available crowd control equipment (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Pepper fogger (69)
____ Mace (70)
____ Tear gas (71)
____ None (72)
____ Other (Specify): (73)

20. The Campus Security Office offers assistance to students in off-campus arrests (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Provide bail (74)
____ Appear in court as guardian (75)
____ Obtain legal counsel (76)
____ Custody in lieu of bail (77)
____ None (78)
____ Other (Specify): (79)

Blank (80)

Do Not Fill In

21. The Campus Security Office participates in policy-making in the following areas (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Student codes of conduct __(6)
____ Traffic regulations __(7)
____ Mass disorder strategy __(8)
____ Catastrophic events __(9)
____ Student discipline __(10)

22. The Campus Security Office meets regularly with committees of the following (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Faculty __(11)
____ Student body __(12)
____ Office of Student Affairs __(13)
____ Administration __(14)
____ Joint committees __(15)
____ None __(16)
____ Other (Specify): __(17)

23. The Campus Security Office regularly exchanges information with the Office of Student Affairs concerning the following (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Suspicious student conduct __(18)
____ Minor misconduct __(19)
____ Student trouble maker __(20)
____ Student under psychiatric care __(21)
____ None __(22)
____ Other (Specify): __(23)

Blank (24)

Do Not Fill In

24. The Campus Security Office participates in or sponsors the following programs for students (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Orientation briefings __(25)
____ Traffic safety __(26)
____ Anti-Crime forums __(27)
____ Civil Defense __(28)
____ Narcotics and vice lectures __(29)
____ Other (Specify): __(30)

25. The local police are available for the following services (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Emergency manpower __(31)
____ Training Campus Security personnel __(32)
____ Joint investigation __(33)
____ Regular conferences __(34)
____ Special events manpower __(35)
____ None __(36)
____ Other (Specify): __(37)

26. Campus Security Officers have certain advantages over the local police (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Higher salary range __(38)
____ Higher employment standards __(39)
____ Better equipment __(40)
____ More experienced personnel __(41)
____ Less personnel turnover __(42)
____ None __(43)
____ Other (Specify): __(44)

Blank (45)

Do Not Fill In

27. The local police permit some violations of municipal and state law to be handled within the school's discipline structure (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Homosexualism (46)
____ Petit Larceny (47)
____ Drunkenness (48)
____ Vandalism (49)
____ Narcotics (50)
____ None (51)
____ Other (Specify): (52)

28. In the event of a campus disorder, your school has a plan that places primary policy-making authority with the following (Check all spaces that apply)

____ President (53)
____ Campus Security (54)
____ Joint command group (55)
____ Dean of Student Affairs (56)
____ Plan is secret (57)
____ No plan (58)

29. In your campus disorder plan, when outside police aid is present, decisions as to tactics to be employed are made by the following (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Outside police aid (59)
____ Campus Security (60)
____ President (61)
____ Dean of Student Affairs (62)
____ Joint command group (63)
____ Other (Specify): (64)
Blank (65)

Do Not Fill In

30. An increase in the Campus Security force is necessary because of the following (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Larger student body (66)
____ More vehicles on campus (67)
____ Student protest (68)
____ More buildings to patrol (69)
____ Rise in individual crime rate (70)
____ No increase necessary (71)
____ Other (Specify): (72)

31. In the event you have had campus disorder, your school has taken the following action (Check all spaces that apply)

____ Outside police called (73)
____ Criminal charges filed (74)
____ Civil damage suit filed (75)
____ Injunction obtained (76)
____ Curfew enforced by Campus Security (77)
____ Ban on non-students enforced by Campus Security (78)
____ None (79)
____ Other (Specify): (80)

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

TALLAHASSEE 32306

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A Survey of the Campus Security Office

The following series of questions comprise an appraisal of the campus security office. They are being submitted to campus security officers, administrators, faculty, and students to determine how each views the role and purpose of this office.

The responses of individuals and the identification of characteristics of specific institutions will not be released or published.

PLEASE DO NOT FILL IN

1. Name of Institution _____ ___(1-3)

2. Title of Person Completing Questionnaire _____ __(4,5)

3. Select the goals you deem particularly appropriate for the Campus Security Office (Please check as Many Spaces as Apply)

____ Provide protection for property and person. __(6)
____ Establish and enforce rules of conduct. __(7)
____ Maintain order on campus. __(8)
____ Interpret to students the function of police agencies in our society. __(9)
____ Provide an organized system for traffic and parking. __(10)
____ Aid students in the educational process. __(11)
____ Other (Please Specify): __(12)

4. Select the changes in the use of authority by the Campus Security Officer that you believe could markedly improve his relationships on campus. (Check as Many Spaces as Apply)

____ Use a less authoritarian enforcement approach. __(13)
____ Eliminate use of informers. __(14)
____ Increase Campus Security Officer authority equal to status of municipal or state enforcement agency. __(15)
____ Limit Campus Security Officer to non-arrest authority. __(16)
____ Replace standard police uniforms with civilian-like attire. __(17)
____ Require Security Officers to carry weapons concealed on their person. __(18)
____ Other (Please Specify): __(19)

Blank (20)

5. Select the administrative procedures which could significantly improve the operation of the Campus Security Office. (Please Check as Many Spaces as Apply)

Please Do Not Fill In
____ Centralized state-wide coordinating body to establish standards for Campus Security Office.	__(21)
____ Campus Security Office directly responsible to President in chain of command.	__(22)
____ Campus Security Office participation in policy-making concerning student discipline.	__(23)
____ Traffic and parking revenue solely for student services.	__(24)
____ Student Ombudsman to review Campus Security performance.	__(25)
____ Joint Faculty-Student Committee to review Campus Security performance.	__(26)
____ Other (Please Specify):	__(27)

6. Select the main causes which account for student misunderstanding about the role of the Campus Security Office. (Please Check as Many Spaces as Apply)

____ Students don't understand the duties of the Campus Security Officer.	__(28)
____ Student regulations are not given wide enough campus distribution.	__(29)
____ Too few channels of communication exist between the Campus Security Office and the students.	__(30)
____ The Campus Security Office is too low in the status hierarchy to maintain the respect of students.	__(31)
____ The Campus Security is a policing agency and as such is unacceptable to the academic community.	__(32)
____ Other (Please Specify):	__(33)

7. Select the enforcement actions which are more likely to create stress situations that cause a deterioration of the relationship between students and the Campus Security Office. (Please Check as Many Spaces as Apply)

____ Issue Parking Tickets	__(34)
____ Investigate Crimes of Violence	__(35)
____ Search Dorms for Contraband	__(36)
____ Use of Necessary Force Against Student Disorders	__(37)
____ Patrol Grounds	__(38)
____ Direct Traffic	__(39)
____ None	__(40)
____ Other (Please Specify):	__(41)
	Blank (42)

8. Select the several purposes served by having a formal institutional policy regarding student demonstrations. (Please Check as Many Spaces as Apply)

	Please Do Not Fill In
____ Establishes behavioral standards for a desirable campus climate.	__(43)
____ Supports demonstrations as an appropriate means of expression.	__(44)
____ Recognizes that demonstrations provide a learning experience.	__(45)
____ A formal policy is a firm declaration in support of community law.	__(46)
____ Students know bounds of institutional acceptance of demonstrations.	__(47)
____ Other (Please Specify):	__(48)

9. Select the occurrences that may well change an orderly student demonstration into a campus disorder. (Please Check as Many Spaces as Apply)

____ The mere presence of outside police agencies.	__(49)
____ Failure of the Campus Security Office to take prompt, early, deterrent action.	__(50)
____ Campus Security efforts to control the demonstration.	__(51)
____ Overreaction by outside police agencies to potential threat.	__(52)
____ Delay in calling in outside police agencies.	__(53)
____ Other (Please Specify):	__(54)

10. Select the attitudes that you believe will prevail in the event the Campus Security Office properly uses the force necessary to respond to campus disorder situations. (Please Check as Many Spaces as Apply)

____ Students will respect Campus Security Officers for properly doing their job.	__(55)
____ Students will resent the Campus Security use of force, no matter the legal manner force was administered.	__(56)
____ Faculty will reject the use of force generally, and particularly by an agency of the academic institution.	__(57)
____ Faculty will support the Campus Security Office, in that the action was necessary to protect life and property.	__(58)
____ Administration will favor Campus Security action because it avoided need for outside police agencies.	__(59)
____ Student Personnel Officers will disassociate themselves from the actions of the campus security Office.	__(60)
____ Other (Please Specify):	__(61)
	Blank (62)

NOTE: The following are Rank Order questions that require you to make three choices and to number them in order of their importance.

11. From among the following duties of the Campus Security office choose the three (3) areas performed most effectively and number them 1, 2, 3, in order of importance.

1. ____ Buildings and ground patrol
2. ____ Ambulance service
3. ____ Criminal investigation
4. ____ Key control
5. ____ Parking
6. ____ Student disorders
7. ____ Traffic control
8. ____ Other (Please Specify):

Please Do Not Fill In

__(63)

__(64)

__(65)

12. From among the several personnel changes suggested, choose the three (3) changes which in your opinion would most improve the performance of the Campus Security Office and number them 1, 2, 3, in order of importance.

1. ____ Increase in salary
2. ____ Larger staff
3. ____ Better equipment
4. ____ Higher educational requirements
5. ____ More student security officers
6. ____ More specialized training in human behavior
7. ____ More female security officers
8. ____ Other (Specify):

__(66)

__(67)

__(68)

13. In the event force is deemed necessary, choose the three (3) enforcement agencies most qualified to respond to campus disorder and number them 1, 2, 3, in order of importance.

1. ____ Municipal police
2. ____ State forces
3. ____ Federal forces
4. ____ Campus Security Office
5. ____ Special volunteer auxiliary force
6. ____ None
7. ____ Other (Please Specify):

__(69)

__(70)

__(71)

* If you would like a summary of the findings of this study, please indicate by checking this space. ____

__(72)

Appendix B.

SOURCE OF CAMPUS AUTHORITY: BY STATE
(As of July, 1970)

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
Alabama	Code of Ala. (recompiled 1958), Ch. 25, Title 52, Sections 484 (1), 500, 509 (114), 590 (126), 509 (152). Statute for each state university permits President, with approval of Board of Trustees to appoint suitable officer and such officers shall have authority to summon posse. Laws of Alabama, Act No. 1125, Regular Session 1969. State University President may appoint suitable persons to act as police officers (without approval of Board of Trustees). Act relates to state colleges and universities.	Attorney General letter, March 2, 1970. Campus police are charged with all the duties and invested with all the powers of police officers and may eject trespassers from the college buildings and grounds. The campus police officers shall cooperate with and when requested, furnish assistance to the regularly constituted authorities of the municipalities in which such universities are located.
Alaska	Alaska Stat. Ch. 65 Sec. 18.65.010 (a)(1966). The Commissioner of Public Safety may appoint as special officers, persons with adequate police training who will have authority in same manner as state troopers.	University of Alaska letter, March 6, 1970. A special officers commission in the Alaska State Troopers is issued and the Alaska State Troopers also supply troopers on a contract basis.

Arizona	Arizona Rev. Stat. Sec. 15-725.01 F. Appointment by the President of University with Board of Regents approval provides same authority as police officer.	Attorney General Opinion, November 25, 1969. Junior Colleges may not invest security officer with police power.
Arkansas	Ark. Stat. Ann. Sec. 7-112, 7-113 7-115 (1967). Each state educational institution may promulgate rules and regulations for operation of motor vehicles and parking, and may designate a security officer who shall possess all powers provided local police. He shall conspicuously wear a badge when on duty.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.
California	Calif. Education Code Ch. 4, Sec. 23501. Regents authorized to appoint members of university police department with authority of peace officers. Calif. Education Code Ch. 12, Sec. 24651. Trustees may appoint state college police department for each state college with authority of peace officers. Calif. Education Code, Sec. 15831. The governing boards of the various schools districts have authority to establish security patrols at public junior colleges and its members are peace officers.	In re Bacon 240 Cal. App. 2d 34, 54 (1966). The fact that a school may employ its own police force does not in any way deprive the sheriff or the city police of their concurrent jurisdiction over the campus. Attorney General Opinion 26, 1961. Duties pertaining to position of university policemen are largely custodial and their law enforcement activities are ancillary to the duty of protecting university property. Attorney General Opinion 1969. Authority of Peace Officers on School Campuses.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
California (Cont'd)		No officer or employee of a public or private school has the authority to prevent the entry or direct the removal of any peace officer in the enforcement of the criminal law.
Colorado	Colorado Rev. Stat. Ch. 99, Art. 2, 1963. State and private campus security officers are deputized by municipal and county law enforcement agencies with authority of peace officer. Laws of Colorado, Ch. 302, Session Laws, 1969. Any state institution of higher education may promulgate rules and regulations for operation and parking of motor vehicles and may cede such enforcement jurisdiction to the town, city or county in which the school is located.	Attorney General Opinion 68-4241, August 16, 1968. Town and municipal police officers have the duty to render assistance on state property when called upon by college officials or other college personnel.
Connecticut	Gen. Stat. Conn. Ch. 96, Sec. 7.95 (1949). The selectmen of any town may appoint the janitor of any public building to be a constable to preserve the peace.	Attorney General letter, February 11, 1970. State and private campus police acquire arrest authority by virtue of their being designated special state policemen and town constables.

Delaware	Delaware Code, Title 10, Section 2716 (1953). The Governor may appoint Special Constables for the protection of property and to preserve the peace upon application of any individual, firm, corporation (university) association or property. This is applicable to both state and private schools.	Attorney General Opinion, August 2, 1966. The campus security function is limited to preservation of peace and good order within their presence. They are not invested with general police powers. Campus constables have no authority to arrest (physically detain) for those infractions of University rules which are not also violations of State law.
Florida	Fla. Stat. Sec. 239.58 (1)(1970). Board of Regents may employ security personnel in the university system with authority of peace officers.	Attorney General Opinion, June 20, 1968. Campus security officers are required to conform to state requirements for minimum training of police officers.
Georgia	Ga. Laws, Gen. Act. 370 (1966). Campus policemen and other security personnel who are regular employees of the University System of Georgia shall have the power to make arrests for offenses committed upon any property under the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents.	Attorney General Opinion 67-327, September 13, 1967. Campus patrolmen may patrol in unmarked vehicles but may not use such cars to make arrests for traffic violations. Attorney General Opinion 67-328, September 13, 1967. City police may exercise jurisdiction over a campus within its city limits. Attorney General letter, February 11, 1970.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
Georgia (Cont'd)		As a matter of course, campus security officers of the Board of Regents System are deputized by the city and county law enforcement agencies at the location of each institution.
Hawaii	Hawaii Rev. Stat. Ch. 308, Sec. 1. The Board of Regents may make rules and regulations governing traffic and parking conditions.	Attorney General letter, February, 1970. Arrest authority of campus security officers is based on individual commissions granted to them by the county chief of police.
Idaho	Idaho Code Ch. 33, Sec. 3716 (3) 1969. The chief administration officer of any community college, junior college, college or university may designate person charged with maintaining order on campus and failure to obey his lawful order in certain enumerated offenses will be a misdemeanor.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.
Illinois	Ill. Rev. Stat. Ch. 144, Sec. 1008 (10)(1967). The Board of Governors of state colleges and universities shall	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.

	appoint members of the police department with all powers of arrest. Ill. Rev. Stat. Ch. 102, Sec. 42 (1969). State or local law enforcement officials may appoint members of junior college security department with full powers of arrest.	
Indiana	Ind. Acts. Ch. 169, Sec. 9-1024. Watchmen may arrest and detain any person found violating any law of this state.	Attorney General letter, March 16, 1970. Campus policemen as watchmen have the power to make arrest for misdemeanors occurring in their presence.
Iowa	Iowa Code Ann. Ch. 262, Sec. 13, 1969. The Board of Regents may authorize institutions under its control to commission special security officers with peace officer authority.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.
Kansas	Kan. Sess. Law Senate Bill No. 398 Sec. 16 (1970). The chief executive of any state university or college may employ campus policemen to aid and supplement local law enforcement agencies. Such campus policemen shall have the authority of peace and police officers	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
Kansas (Cont'd)	and shall while on duty wear and publicly display a badge of office. Kan. Stat. Ann. Ch. 74-3210 (1957). The State Board of Regents shall control all roads, streets, driveways and parking facilities for motor vehicles.	
Kentucky	Ky. Rev. Stat. 61.360 (1946). The Governor may appoint special local police officers to serve as special officers on campus to preserve the peace and protect the property of the institution.	Attorney General Opinion 43, 872, 1959. The Board of Education may expend funds for employment of special police to maintain order but the Board cannot contract away its liability under the statute. Attorney General letter, February 27, 1970. The enforcement of state law rests upon the authority of the municipal police, county police, sheriff's office or state police inasmuch as campus security officers do not have any specific or general arrest authority.

Louisiana	Laws of La. Act No. 529, 1968. Campus security officers of any state supported college or university have authority of peace officers to carry concealed weapons and exercise power of arrest.	Attorney General Opinion 107, May 20, 1969. A sheriff in a parish has the right to enter campuses under control of the State Board of Education, upon a complaint or based on information received or circumstances viewed. Attorney General letter, February 5, 1970. Practice in Louisiana is for parish sheriff of the appropriate municipal offices to deputize campus security police.
Maine	Me. Rev. Stat. Ch. 34, Sec. 93 (1961). The superintendents of state institutions are authorized to appoint special police officers to patrol public ways.	Attorney General Letter, April 1, 1970. Arrest authority is based on being deputized by municipal or county law enforcement agencies.
Maryland	Ann. Code of Md. Art. 41, Sec. 60-70, 1969. The Governor may appoint Special Policemen with powers of arrest for any property within state.	Attorney General Opinion, August 12, 1968. The campus police constitute a law enforcement agency for the purpose of being furnished information and intelligence from other state and law enforcement agencies.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
Massachusetts	Mass. G. L. C. 147, Sec. 10 G (1965). The State Commissioner of Public Safety may at the request of an officer of a college, university or other educational institution appoint special police officers with the same power as regular police officer. Mass. G. L. C. 147 Sec. F (1969). Any educational institution may appoint parking control officers who shall have authority of police officers in regard regulating traffic and parking.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.
Michigan	Mich. Stat. Ann. Ch. 4.203 (1965). The boards controlling state educational institutions may appoint policemen, watchmen or attendants with general authority of sheriffs relative to arrest and custody of offenders trespassing or injuring property.	Attorney General Opinion No. 63, October 22, 1947. Guards appointed by a state board to protect property may carry firearms.

Minnesota	Minn. Laws, Ch. 266, Sec. 137.12 (1969). The Regents may employ two investigators with police power but arrest shall be exercised only in connection with investigations authorized by the Regents.	Attorney General letter, February 17, 1970. University police officers are also deputized by local police departments and/or county sheriffs. No statutory provision for arrest authority exists for private security forces hired by colleges to act as night watchmen.
Mississippi	Miss. Code Ann. Sec. 6706 (1942). Peace officers appointed by the board of trustees of state institutions of higher learning are vested with the powers of a constable for the purpose of preventing and punishing all violations of law on university and college grounds.	Cohen v. Mississippi State University 256 F. Supp. 954 (1966). Court upheld constitutionality of statute (Sec. 6706).
Missouri	R. S. Mo. Sec. 172.350 (1959). The curators of the University of Missouri may appoint and employ watchmen not to exceed six who shall be paid not more than $75.00 per month with the same power as peace officers to maintain order, preserve peace, and make arrests. The curators may also grant other employees and faculty members the same authority.	Attorney General Opinion 108, December 19, 1968. City police as well as the sheriff and state highway patrol have authority to investigate and arrest for violation of criminal law on the University of Missouri campus. Watchmen, with authority as peace officers to make arrest, are under duty to report any violation of state law. Attorney General letter, February 6, 1970.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
Missouri (Cont'd)		As a matter of practice, the University of Missouri security are also deputized by municipal or county law enforcement agencies as are state teachers colleges.
Montana	R.C.M. Sec. 11-3266 (1947). Cities under commission-manager form of government may appoint special policemen for one year periods to allow the campus police force to issue tickets for moving traffic violations.	Attorney General letter, February 10, 1970. Campus security officers do not have arrest authority.
Nebraska	Neb. R. S., Supp. Sec. 29.401 (1967). Every sheriff, watchman, police officer or peace officer shall arrest and detain any person found violating any law of this state.	Attorney General letter, February 13, 1970. All of our public colleges and universities are certainly within the authority area of either the municipal police force or the county sheriff.
Nevada	N.R.S. 169.125 (1969). Members of the University of Nevada police department are peace officers.	Attorney General letter, February 10, 1970. Our campus security officers are possessed of police powers, independent of municipal and county law enforcement agencies.

New Hampshire	N.H. Rev. Stat. Ch. 105:1 (1947). The selectmen of a town may appoint special police officers.	Attorney General letter, February 9, 1970. Arrest authority granted to campus security officers must originate in their deputization as local or county law enforcement officers.
New Jersey	New Jersey Session Law, Senate No. 764 (1970). The governing body of any institution of higher education may appoint persons to act as policemen who shall possess all the powers of policemen.	Attorney General letter, July 2, 1970. The power to enforce the laws regulating traffic and the operation of motor vehicles shall first require the concurrence of the local chief of police.
New Mexico	N.M.S.A. 39-5-2 (1968). Regents of each of the state's public universities may create a campus security police with the power of peace officers. No arrest for violation relating to motor vehicles is valid unless the officer is wearing a badge and uniform. N.M.S.A. 39-5-2 (C) (1970) (Amendment to above). The chief of the state police shall have jurisdiction over any campus security force.	Attorney General letter, February 10, 1970 (in opposition to amendment). I have attempted to make clear to the Legislature that our present laws permit the state police to exercise jurisdiction on college campuses in precisely the same manner as on any other sort of state property. (Amendment vetoed by Governor, March 5, 1970).

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
New York	New York Education Law Sec. 355 (m)(1953). State University trustees may appoint special policemen who shall be peace officers to preserve law and order on campus. This appointment shall not supersede the authority of peace officers of a jurisdiction within which such buildings or grounds are located.	Schuyler v. State University of New York at Albany, 297 N.Y.S. 2d 368, (1969). Administrators of college possess inherent authority to maintain order on campus and freedom of movement thereon.
North Carolina	N. Car. Sec. 74A-1, 2 (1965). Any educational institution, whether State or private, or security patrol or corporation may apply to Governor to commission persons to act as special policemen with powers of municipal and county police officers to make arrests on the specified property.	Attorney General Opinion, February 2, 1970. A special policeman appointed by the Governor is a public officer and while acting within the scope of his authority may make an arrest for both misdemeanors and felonies committed in his presence.
North Dakota	N. Dak. Century Code Sec. 15-10-17.1 (1969). The Board of Education may authorize the use of special policemen to assist in enforcing the regulations and the law on the campus of a college or university, which special policemen shall have	Attorney General Opinion (unofficial) February 9, 1970. Campus police have same power of arrest on public campus as is given other law enforcement officials. Attorney General Opinion, December 30, 1969.

	concurrent jurisdiction with other law enforcement officers.	Special Policemen may issue parking tickets to promote order and safety on campus and may impose a fine for such violation.
Ohio	Ohio Rev. Code Sec. 3545.04 (1967). Boards of trustees of state universities may designate special policemen to protect the property, suppress nuisances and disturbances and breaches of the peace and enforce laws for the preservation of good order. They may arrest for violation of state law or regulation prescribed by governing board of institution.	Attorney General Opinion No. 69-064, June 18, 1969. The municipal court may not prosecute nor levy fines for violations of rules and regulations of state universities. McConnel v. City of Columbus 173 N.E.^{2} 760, 1961. A municipality must provide fire and police protection for university property within city limits. Attorney General letter, February 9, 1970. The State Highway Patrol and local police authorities have concurrent jurisdiction on state university property.
Oklahoma	Okla. Stat. Ann. Title 70, Ch. 4304 (1965). The Board of Regents may appoint campus police for the purpose of protecting all properties of state educational institutions with powers of peace officers.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
Oregon	Ore. Rev. Stat. 352.360 (3) (1969). The State Board of Higher Education may appoint peace officers for the purpose of enforcing its rules and regulations governing traffic control.	Attorney General letter, March 17, 1970. Security officers of state institutions of higher education have statutory arrest authority only for traffic control purposes and any other arrest authority they (and private institutions) may have is derived from deputization by public law enforcement agencies.
Pennsylvania	Pa. Code Cf. 71 Sec. 646 (1968). Campus security officers at all state owned, state aided or state related colleges shall enforce good order, protect the property of the state and exclude disorderly persons from the premises with the same arrest powers as the police. Pa. Adm. Code 2851, Sec. 310 (1933). Any non-profit corporation maintaining any buildings or grounds open to the public or organized for the prevention of cruelty to children and aged persons may apply to Judge of Court of Common Pleas for appointment of policemen who shall have power of constable.	Attorney General letter, February 16, 1970. Campus security officers at private institutions derive their arrest authority by deputization.

Rhode Island	Gen. Laws Rhode Island Ch. 16 Sec. 45-16-8, 9 (1896). Every town council may elect one or more special constables who upon request of any citizen and upon being tendered the sum of thirty cents for each hour of service required, attend any school or meeting for the purpose of preventing any interruption or disturbance therein, with power of arrest.	Attorney General letter, February 12, 1970. State law does not grant arrest authority to campus security officers. Any authority they may have to arrest would be based on being deputized by a municipal agency.
South Carolina	S. Car. Code Sec. 53-3 (1952). The Governor may appoint such deputies, constables and detectives as he deems necessary to assist in detection of crime and the enforcement of any criminal laws.	Attorney General letter, February 16, 1970. Campus security police for state owned institutions operate under the supervision of the director of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, known as the Governor's Constabulary. No police power is conferred upon the security police by statute but each is issued a commission as a State Constable without pay. This appointment confers full police power upon campus security.
South Dakota	S. Dak. Comp. Laws Ch. 23-3-1 (1887). The mayor or other officer having the direction of the police in a city or town must order a force sufficient to preserve the peace, to attend any public meeting when	Attorney General Opinion, November 18, 1967. A campus law enforcement official is not designated as a peace officer and therefore may not make an arrest or serve a warrant in that official capacity.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
South Dakota (Cont'd)	he is satisfied that a breach of the peace may be apprehended.	Attorney General letter, February 10, 1970. South Dakota does not grant arrest authority to campus security officers. There have been some incidents in which campus security officers were deputized by municipal police. However, because of a variety of difficulties in the chain of command, it is our belief that at the present time few, if any, campus security officers in this state are deputized by municipalities or county agencies.
Tennessee	Tenn. Code Ann. Ch. 8 Sec. 821 (1870). The sheriff may appoint as many special deputies as he may think proper on urgent occasions, or when required for particular purposes with power of arrest.	Attorney General letter, February 9, 1970. There is no statutory authority for campus police. The general practice has been for people performing that type of work to be deputized by the sheriff of the county where the university is located and in some instances they are deputized by both.

Texas	Tex. Art. 2919j, Sec. 3 (1969). The governing boards of the state institutions of higher education are authorized to employ campus security officers and commission such officers as peace officers.	Morris v. Nowotny SW^2 301. In action for false arrest (1959), against University of Texas security officers, the Court ruled that public officers are not liable to individuals for acts done within the scope of their public duties, except when done with malice. Attorney General letter, February 9, 1970. While penal provisions are contained in this legislation, we encourage the campus security officers to use other penal provisions in controlling undesirable activity.
Utah	Utah Code Ann. Sec. 53-45-5 (1969). The governing board of any state institution of higher education may appoint members of police or security department with authority of peace officers.	Attorney General Opinion No. 69-010, February 3, 1969. Where state property is within city limits, the city police may exercise their arrest power if a nuisance or danger to the city is inherent in the action on state property. The city must also respond with assistance if so requested by a state college within city limits.

State	Statutory Authority	Case Law, Attorney General Opinion, Attorney General Letter
Vermont	Vt. Stat. Ann. Title 24 Sec. 307 (1947). With approval of the attorney general, a sheriff may appoint special deputies with the same duties as the sheriff.	Attorney General letter, February 18, 1970. Campus security officers generally base their authority on the grounds of being a deputy sheriff (or special police officer).
Virginia	Code of Va. Sec. 19.1-28 (1960). Campus police possess authority of "conservator of the peace" by judicial appointment.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.
Washington	RCW Ch. 28.76-310, 330 (1965). The Board of Regents for the universities and the board of trustees of the state colleges may establish a police force with authority of peace officers and may establish rules and regulations governing traffic.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.
West Virginia	W. Va. Code Ch. 18-2-24 (1967). State Board of Education authorized to appoint security officers with authority of constables. No enrolled student at any college or university shall be appointed as a security officer.	No cases reported or Attorney General Opinions issued.

Wisconsin	Wis. Stat. Ch. 37-11 Sec. 16 (a) (c)(d)(1869). The Board of Regents may appoint agents to make arrests for violations of state law. This authority is concurrent with regulating the parking of motor vehicles.	Attorney General Opinion 56-4 (1967). Parking on streets abutting university land is under jurisdiction of municipalities.
Wyoming	Wyo. Stat. Title 18, Sec. 174, 187. The sheriff may appoint special deputies to do particular acts and the board of county commissioners may appoint special deputy sheriffs with arrest power for purpose of maintaining order.	Attorney General letter, February 10, 1970. The laws of the State of Wyoming do not grant arrest authority to campus security officers, and their authority is based upon deputization by municipal or county law enforcement agencies.

Appendix C.

STATE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR MINIMUM BASIC TRAINING OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS

State	Type of Police Training Law	Campus Security Participation	Special Campus Security Training
Alabama	None	None	None
Alaska	None	None	None
Arizona	Mandatory	Recruit training	None
Arkansas	Voluntary	Recruit training	None
Colorado	None	None	None
Connecticut	Mandatory	Do not qualify under law. Attend if space available.	None
California	Mandatory	University of California - Must meet Peace Officer Standards and Training (Post). State Colleges - Eligible for but need not comply with Peace Officer Standards and Training (Post). Community Colleges - Not part of program.	Each segment of higher education provides central training program.

State	Type of Police Training Law	Campus Security Participation	Special Campus Security Training
Delaware	Mandatory	Do not qualify under law. Do not attend.	None
Florida	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
Georgia	None	None	None
Hawaii	None	None	None
Idaho	Mandatory	Do not qualify. Do not attend.	None
Illinois	Voluntary	Recruit training. State pays 50% of cost.	Two week Campus Police Training Institute, Univ. of Illinois.
Indiana	Mandatory	Do not qualify. Attend on voluntary basis.	None
Iowa	Mandatory	Recruit training.	Voluntary seminars for private school security officers by Iowa Law Enforcement Academy.
Kansas	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
Kentucky	Voluntary	Recruit training.	One week Campus Security Workshop-Eastern Kentucky Univ.
Louisiana	None	None	None
Maine	None	None	None

State	Type of Police Training Law	Campus Security Participation	Special Campus Security Training
Maryland	Mandatory	Do not qualify. A few have participated.	32-hour course by Army Reserve Unit (planned).
Massachusetts	Mandatory	Do not qualify. Do not attend.	None
Michigan	Voluntary	Recruit training.	None
Minnesota	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
Mississippi	None	None	None
Missouri	None	None	None
Montana	None	None	None
Nebraska	None	None	None
Nevada	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
New Hampshire	None	None	None
New Jersey	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
New Mexico	None	None	None
New York	Mandatory	Recruit training.	Central State coordinator establishes programs.
North Carolina	None	None	None
North Dakota	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
Ohio	Mandatory	Qualify - if armed.	None

State	Type of Police Training Law	Campus Security Participation	Special Campus Security Training
Oklahoma	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
Oregon	Mandatory	Do not qualify.	None
Pennsylvania	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
Rhode Island	None	None	None
South Carolina	Mandatory	Do not qualify. Attend on voluntary basis.	None
Tennessee	Voluntary	Recruit training. State pays cost.	One week school by Tennessee Law Enforcement Academy.
Texas	Mandatory	Recruit training. Only state supported security officers qualify.	The University of Texas System (8 campuses) has own training academy.
Utah	Mandatory	Recruit training.	40-hours in-service training by Division of Peace Officer Standards and Training.
Vermont	Mandatory	Recruit training.	None
Virginia	Mandatory	Do not qualify. Do not attend.	None
Washington	Voluntary	Do not qualify. Attend on space available basis.	None

State	Type of Police Training Law	Campus Security Participation	Special Campus Security Training
West Virginia	None	None	None
Wisconsin	Voluntary	None	None
Wyoming	None	None	None

Appendix D.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING THE CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICER ACCORDING TO THE "MASTER PLANS" FOR CAMPUS DISORDER SITUATIONS AT TWENTY-FIVE SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

School* Description	Initial Duties and Responsibilities	Extent of Early Command Authority	Relationship to Students	Relationship to Outside Police Agencies
South State-Coed Graduate Land Grant 14,000	Protect property and persons. Arrest students committing violent acts. Gather evidence, take photos and identify students.	Office of Student Affairs has primary responsibility with support of Campus Security and Office of Dean of Women.	Read formal statement advising students to cease disruptive activities.	Call auxiliary police and city police when assistance deemed necessary and support their action.
South West State-Coed Graduate Land Grant 12,000	Protect property and persons.	City Chief of Police shall control and direct all actions.	Hold law violators for arrest by civil authorities.	Under command of city police.
Far West State-Coed Undergrad. 8,000	At direction of Dean of Students, campus security will notify Sheriff to stand by and brief deputies.	Dean of Students will direct Campus Security action.	Remove violators from scene at direction of Dean of Students.	Coordinate joint action with Sheriff under direction of Dean of Students.

South East State-Coed Graduate 12,000	Establish command post, apprise Sheriff, assign Control stations.	Primary responsibility rests with Director of Security Department.	Advise students to cease and desist under penalty of law.	Seek aid of Sheriff upon consultation with President. Command then shifts to Sheriff.
South East State-Coed Undergrad. 3,000	Alert department and local police agencies for standby duty. Photograph demonstrators, make voice recordings and require identification.	Upon being advised by President or designee that academic process has been disrupted, campus police shall enforce plan of action.	Read riot act and make necessary arrests.	Call in local police agencies, coordinate activities and establish chain of command.
Mid West State-Coed Graduate 6,500	If obstruction with no damage, remove obstructionists or wait for injunction. If damage committed, make arrests.	Upon failure of students to comply with request of Dean of Student Personnel, the Campus Security Officer will take command.	Read pertinent statutes and give five minutes to disperse.	Outside forces may be called in only at the discretion of the Campus Security Chief. Joint tactical control then prevails.
Mid West State-Coed Graduate 11,000	No action taken until property damage or personal injury has occurred or is imminent.	Decision to make arrests or disperse crowds made by Campus Security after Housing	Response to Residence Hall demonstrations made only at request of	Additional assistance called in at discretion of Safety and Security

School* Description	Initial Duties and Responsibilities	Extent of Early Command Authority	Relationship to Students	Relationship to Outside Police Agencies
(Cont'd from page 211)	Officers visible but at a distance.	and Student Personnel are unsuccessful.	Housing Staff.	Department. Further decisions made jointly.
Mid West Private-Coed Graduate Sectarian 13,500	Lock building doors, control switchboard, check fire alarm and fire equipment.	Dean of Students will confront the protestors and inform them they are subject to prosecution.	It is not responsibility of campus security to direct or control activities of disruptive protestors.	If clear and present danger exists, the Vice-President-Dean will request outside police who will assume primary control.
Mid West State-Coed Graduate 16,000	Primary function is to identify offenders, gather evidence and stand guard.	Determine allocation of security officers and keep President's Office advised.	Unless deputized, campus security should not use force or arrest students.	City or county authorities are to take command only at the direction of the President.
Mid West State-Coed Graduate Land Grant 16,500	Campus security will respond to requests of city police who will make necessary arrests.	President or Vice President will make initial decisions.	Attempt to maintain normal relationship with students and avoid confrontation with students.	Upon request by President or Vice-President, city police will respond to and control disorder situations.

South State-Coed Undergrad. 10,000	Secure all buildings and observe activity.	Dean of Men will confront demonstrators. Joint effort with city and state authorities.	Unless the violence is spontaneous, campus security will attempt to delay action until arrival of outside forces.	At direction of Dean, Campus Security will advise Sheriff to seal off campus. Command then shifts to outside forces.
New England State-Coed Graduate Land Grant 17,000	Position police vehicles on outskirts of disturbance. Alert all off-duty campus security officers.	Campus Security, Dean, President, Provost Treasurer or Secretary of University may request assistance of city or state police.	In the event of impending disorder the Campus Security will remain in background until such time as Student Personnel deems it can no longer cope with the situation.	Outside police support will be briefed and receive orders from campus police.
East State-Coed Junior College 7,500	Individual security officers are without discretion in the enforcement of any rule or regulation; their sole duty is to record all violations.	Under no circumstances will the College Security Department interfere in any demonstrations unless directed to do so after formal request by Dean of Students.	Failure to record an obvious violation or an attempt to judge the guilt or innocence of an alleged violator would subject said officers to disciplinary action.	Upon direction of Dean, Security Department may take whatever measures are necessary and may so direct outside police agencies.

School* Description	Initial Duties and Responsibilities	Extent of Early Command Authority	Relationship to Student	Relationship to Outside Police Agencies
East State-Coed Graduate 7,500	Identify those involved. Eject unauthorized persons who are in violation of the rules.	The Chief Administrative Officer shall be responsible for enforcing regulations.	File charges for violation of University Judicial Procedures.	Chief Administrative Officer will determine need for outside law enforcement agencies.
East Private-Coed Non-Sectarian Graduate 17,000	Call in non-duty officers. Surveil buildings under siege. Keep others from entering building.	President or Provost acting for contingency committee make all decisions.	Remove own weapons, carry mace and night sticks.	Outside mutual aid officers take complete control. Campus security inactive unless aid requested by Sheriff.
South State-Coed Graduate 7,000	Violators of picketing and demonstration laws to be arrested after refusal to comply with request by Chancellor or Dean.	Consult with Administrator on advisory basis. Call in outside aid upon request of Chancellor or Dean.	If building barricaded, no removal of occupants until Chancellor or Dean approve. Advise students to vacate and to cease unlawful activity.	Outside officers may arrest for crimes committed in presence and need no approval from administration or campus security officers.

South State-Coed Graduate 6,500	Arrest those charged with violation. Photograph and record status of arrested persons and advise of rights.	Upon call of President, campus security will determine course of conduct for University to follow.	Advise students to cease and desist.	Sheriff to act as back-up for campus police. City police to transport arrested persons and perform outside perimeter patrol duties.
Mid West State-Coed Graduate Land Grant 7,000	Protect persons and property and to identify participants.	Campus security subject to decisions of administrator.	Administrator will read statement asking for dispersal. Campus security will report violators to Dean of Men.	Administrator determines need for local outside police and call for State and National Guard. If Guard called, it makes tactical decisions.
South State-Coed Graduate 13,500	Arrest non-students, secure communications center, post patrolmen on Administration, Physical Science and Computor Buildings. Take pictures.	Campus security command limited to regular disciplinary problems. President makes decision as to bringing in state forces.	Continue normal operations and relationships with students.	State law enforcement division assumes full authority. Campus security acts as service and auxiliary arm for state.

School* Description	Initial Duties and Responsibilities	Extent of Early Command Authority	Relationship to Students	Relationship to Outside Police Agencies
South State-Women Undergrad. 3,750	Alert off-duty personnel, equip police with riot control equipment, secure roof tops, arrest violators, maintain records.	Campus police force is at direction of the President. Supporting departments (Buildings and Grounds) responsible to campus security.	Confront group with message from President. Require personnel to ignore student insults and taunts.	At direction of President, campus security will call in local or state forces if civil disturbance is beyond their capability.
South West State-Coed Undergrad. 12,000	Act as observers. Request I.D. cards.	Campus police respond to directions of President.	Avoid force, if at all possible. Call civil authorities for arrest.	Outside police called by campus security (at request of President) are independent of college officials.
Mid West State-Coed Graduate 19,000	Advise local law enforcement officers of pending demonstrations, appear at scene not wearing uniforms.	Threatening demonstration requires campus security in force and in uniform but taking no action (awaiting injunction).	Read cease and desist order.	Director of Security shall request additional police or army assistance at request of President. Command shifts to outside police forces.

Far West Private-Coed Sectarian Graduate 2,500	The fire equipment, alarm systems and key control to be concern of campus security.	The security and safety plan for campus emergency procedures prepared and implemented by campus security office.	Campus security to maintain contact with student rather than permit off-campus police to make physical arrests.	Campus security will call outside police under instructions of Vice President. Arrests to be made in cooperation with campus security staff.
South State-Coed Graduate 11,000	Authorize issuance of arrest warrants.	If demonstration disruptive, the Director of Security will take over responsibility from the Dean of Students.	Tear gas, water hoses, billy clubs and mace are not to be used on students unless there is significant destruction.	Director of Security will keep appropriate external agencies apprised and be responsible for utilizing them.
Mid West State-Coed Graduate 22,000	Identify participants and remove them from premises. Secure sensitive areas, (Cashier, Computer); Investigate complaints	Security Chief and Dean of Students determine if Chancellor should be called. Security Chief determines need for outside police.	Advise students of violation of law and penalties thereof.	If need for National Guard, then campus security and other local law enforcement agencies, jointly ask sheriff to make such request to Governor. Upon arrival, Guard maintains control.

School* Description	Initial Duties and Responsibilities	Extent of Early Command Authority	Relationship to Students	Relationship to Outside Police Agencies
Mid West State-Coed Graduate 12,500	Officers dispatched to within thirty seconds of disturbance but not visible. Remove students when requested by personnel counselor.	Alert municipal police and State Highway Patrol at request of administration.	Instruct students to discontinue disorder.	State Highway Patrol assumes command over municipal police and campus security after being called in by security office.

*Several of the schools requested that they not be identified by name and therefore they are described by certain of their characteristics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence. Task Force Report on Campus Disorder. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service, Student Unrest Survey Report. Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, 1970.

U.S. Office of Education. Report, Committee on Easing Tensions in Education. Washington, D.C., 1969.

Books

Baker, Michael, and others. Police on Campus. New York: New York Civil Liberties Union, 1969.

Batchelder, Samuel. Bits of Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Blackwell, Thomas E. College Law Loose Leaf Manual. Santa Monica, California: Thomas Blackwell, 1969.

Bowen, Catherine Drinker. History of Lehigh University. Lehigh, Pa.: Lehigh Alumni Bulletin, 1924.

Bowles, Elizabeth Ann. A Good Beginning. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1967.

Callcolt, George H. History of the University of Maryland. Baltimore, Md.: Maryland Historical Society, 1966.

Curti, Merle and Carstensen, Vernon. The University of Wisconsin. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.

Donnelly, Walter. The University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Ebert, Roger. An Illini Century-One Hundred Years of Campus Life. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Eschenbacker, Herman F. The University of Rhode Island. New York: Meredith Publishing, 1967.

Freitag, Albert J. College With a Cause. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing, 1964.

Hamm, Carl W., and Kobetz, Richard W. Campus Unrest-Dialoque or Destruction? Washington, D.C.: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1970.

Hopkins, James F. The University of Kentucky-Origin and Early Years. Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1951.

Iannarelli, Alfred V. The Campus Police. Hayward, California: Precision Photo Form, 1968.

Kenny, Michael. Centenary Story of Spring Hill College. New York: The American Press, 1931.

Knowles, Asa S. Handbook of College and University Administrators. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Mallett, Charles Edward. A History of the University of Oxford. Vol. 1: The Medieval University. New York: Longsmans, Green, 1924.

Manley, Robert N. Centennial History of the University of Nebraska. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.

Marriner, Ernest Cummings. The History of Colby College. Waterville, Maine: Colby College Press, 1963.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. Harvard College in the 17th Century. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Miller, Russell E. History of Tufts College. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

Overman, James Robert. The History of Bowling Green State University. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Press, 1967.

Peckham, Howard. The Making of the University of Michigan 1817-1967. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1967.

Pollard, James E. History of the Ohio State University 1873-1948. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1952.

Porter, Earl W. Trinity and Duke 1892-1924. Durham, North Carolina: University Press, 1964.

Post, Richard S., and Kingsbury, Arthur A. Security Administration. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1970.

Quincy, Isiah. History of Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass.: John Owen, 1840.

Richardson, Leon Burr. History of Dartmouth College. Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 1967.

Skillman, David B. The Biography of a College Life at Lafayette College. Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Press, 1932.

Taft, Robert. Across the Years at Mount Oread. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1941.

Weaver, Glenn. The History of Trinity College. Hartford, Conn.: Trinity College Press, 1967.

Williams, Howard. A History of Colgate University 1819-1969. New York: Van Nostrand, Reinhold Company, 1969.

Wiser, William. Yale Memories. New Haven, Conn.: Morehouse and Taylor, 1914.

Articles

Armistead, Timothy W. "Police on Campus." Issues in Criminology, IV (Fall, 1969), 171-184.

Bartram, John, and Smith, Larry E. "A Survey of Campus Police Forces." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, XXI (November, 1969), 35-43.

Becker, Ralph. "Contract Security's New Answer to Old Problems." American School and University, XL (July, 1968), 37-38.

Lankes, George A. "Campus Violence and the Law." The Police Chief (March, 1970), 38-42.

Lipset, Seymour M., and Altback, Philip G. "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States." Comparative Education Review, X (June, 1966), 320-349.

Lusky, Louis, and Lusky, Mary H. "Columbia 1968: The Wound Unhealed." Political Science Quarterly, LXXXIV (June, 1969), 169-288.

McDaniel, William E. "Safety and Security on the Campus." The Police Chief (April, 1970), 68-70.

Powell, John. "Professionalizing Campus Security." Security World, IV (May, 1967), 23-27, 38.

Schetelin, Eleanor. "Disorders, Deans and Discipline: A Record of Change." Journal, National Association of Women Deans, XXX (Summer, 1967), 169-173.

Scott, Joseph W., and El-Assal, Mohamed. Multiversity University Size, University Quality and Student Protest." American Sociological Review, XXXIV (October, 1969), 702-709.

Van Alstyne, William. "The Student as University Resident." Denver Law Journal, XVL (Special, 1968), 582-590.

Willis, John. "Improving Communications in Patrols and Emergencies." American School and University, XIL (July, 1969), 33, 60.

Reports - Published

American Bar Association. Report of the Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent. Chicago, Illinois: American Bar Association, 1970.

Astin, Alexander W., and Bayer, Alan E. Campus Disruption During 1968-69. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Fact Finding Commission to Investigate Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May, 1968. The Cox Commission, Crisis at Columbia. New York: Vintage, 1968.

International Association of College and University Security Directors. Security Service Analysis. Macomb, Illinois: Western Illinois University, 1970.

Linowitz, Sol M. (Chairman). Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Constructive Changes to Ease Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1970.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). Institutional Policies on Controversial Topics. Detroit, Michigan: NASPA, 1968.

Peterson, Richard E. The Scope of Organized Student Protest in the United States 1967-68. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Unpublished Material

Etheridge, Robert F. "A Study of Campus Protective and Enforcement Agencies at Selected Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1958.

Nielsen, Swen C. "General Observation of Organizational and Administrative Concepts of University Police." Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1970.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1973 O—492-894